

The Forum.

FEBRUARY, 1893.

TARIFF REFORM: RETROSPECTIVE AND PROSPECTIVE.

By their votes at the recent Presidential election the people of the United States have unmistakably expressed their opinion that the economic policy which for more than a quarter of a century has dominated and restricted its foreign commerce shall be in a greater or less degree abandoned and a more liberal system substituted. Standing thus as the country does at a parting of the ways, a brief retrospect of the progress of tariff-reform ideas in comparatively recent years and a forecast of what may be anticipated from their practical application in compliance with the wish of the people may not now be unprofitable.

It can hardly be doubted that had not the war intervened the United States would have become the leading free-trade nation of the world. Neither can it be doubted, all unfounded and partisan assertions to the contrary, that economically and industrially the period of low tariffs from 1847 to 1860 was, as Professor Sumner has characterized it, "the golden age" of our national history, marked by "simplicity even to dullness in national affairs": when the balance of trade between the United States and all foreign countries was "never more regular and equal"; when foreign commerce and American shipping increased as never before or since; and when domestic manufactures, which it was prophesied would perish, not only did not perish, but made steady and genuine progress. The subjects of the tariff and the antagonistic theories of protection and free trade so far ceased to be topics of general interest that they were not specially referred to in the platforms of either of the two great political parties in the Presidential election of 1856. And in 1857 the average rate of duty of

Copyright, 1892, by the Forum Publishing Company.

twenty-five and one-half per cent on dutiable imports established by the tariff of 1846 was reduced to twenty and one-fourth per cent, a majority of the Senators and Representatives from New England voting in favor of the reduction, including Senators Sumner and Wilson, of Massachusetts, the latter of whom declared in the Senate in 1861 that the tariff as then (1857) established, "precisely and exactly as it stands to-day, so far as the productive industry of the commonwealth of Massachusetts is concerned, is the best tariff ever put upon the statute-books of this country." In 1861, the impending political troubles having caused an increase in the expenditures of the Government and a decrease in its revenues, the tariff rates of 1857 were increased about one-third; but it is noticeable that the debates in Congress contingent upon such action hinged almost entirely upon the necessity for more revenue and not for more protection to American industries; and Mr. Morrill, of Vermont, who was then a member of the House, is on record as saying ("Congressional Globe," 1869-70, p. 3295) that the tariff of 1861 "was not asked for and but coldly welcomed by manufacturers." Whatever increase, furthermore, was made in the rates of the tariff of 1861, avowedly for protection, was done mainly to make sure that Pennsylvania, in the pending or prospective troubles, would be on the side of the Union. But the war intervened; and in the face of a necessity for providing extraordinary revenues to defray the expenditures of the Government in its struggle for existence—expenditures that for a lengthened period averaged nearly three millions of dollars per day—the consideration of any or all other fiscal or economic problems became a matter of comparatively little importance. In providing for this necessity no recognition of anything like principle in taxation was attempted. Everything that could yield revenue was taxed, and if more revenue was needed the taxes—internal and customs—were increased; and so eminently successful was this system in respect to its sole purpose that the amount of revenue accruing under it during the last year of the war (\$519,949,000) was greater than has ever before or since been collected by any other nation in any one year by methods having any claim to be called taxation.

With the close of the war it became evident that the nation would not and in fact could not tolerate a system of revenue which necessity had created and patriotism had alone made effective, a moment longer than was necessary; a system that taxed processes and products, capital and income, trades and professions, sales and receipts, legacies and

successions, luxuries and necessities, and nearly all imports. And as the so-called internal revenue taxes were the most obvious and apparently the most grievous, the work of tax-reform began by general consent in this department, and under the constant pressure of public opinion, was prosecuted so vigorously by Congress that in little more than three years after the war, its marvellously complex and irrational structure was brought down to a comparatively simple and rational basis. And as one illustration of the nature and rapidity of this work, a fact now generally overlooked or entirely forgotten may be recalled to memory, namely, that the taxes on manufactures and products, which for the year 1866 were productive of \$127,230,000 of revenue, yielded in 1869, through remissions, but \$3,345,000, and on and after 1874 returned only what were termed "back" (or deferred) collections—a case of abatement of taxes and revenue in a given time that also finds no parallel in the experience of any other nation. A general revision in the direction of reduction of the tariff, the rates of which had been greatly advanced during the war for the sake of revenue and also to a degree far more sufficient than to compensate in most cases for any internal revenue taxes imposed on domestic products subject to foreign competition, was regarded as inexpedient until the latter system of taxation could be reconstructed and abated; a conclusion eminently satisfactory to the whole manufacturing interest of the country, although not fully appreciated by the public, inasmuch as the removal of every internal revenue tax on manufactured products without a corresponding reduction in the tariff on competitive imports was equivalent to an increase in protection. The friends of high protection were not, however, satisfied with this condition of things. They wanted more restriction of trade and commerce through more taxes, and pleading protection and the necessity of protecting American industry, they succeeded in creating or perpetuating some of the most wanton abuses that have ever characterized the fiscal legislation of any country. Duties on importation of foreign salt, increased from one and one-half cents per bushel in 1857 to thirty-seven cents (gold) in 1868–69, had so increased the average price of salt in the United States as to entail a tax upon its people in this latter year of \$7,250,000; of which (according to Mr. William M. Grosvenor, of the New York "Tribune") "precisely \$1,130,225.75 was paid to the Government and over six millions in gold in the shape of bounty,"¹ and mainly to one combine of domestic-salt-manufacturers. It was during

¹ See "Does Protection Protect?"

these years also that an assemblage of wool-growers and wool-manufacturers, having regard exclusively to their own private interests, concocted and caused to be enacted the famous and complicated wool-tariff of 1867, which had for its object the denial to the American people of a privilege enjoyed by almost every other nation, namely, a free supply of wool adequate to their necessities for good and cheap clothing; and which has resulted in fraud to the consumers, torment to the manufacturers, and disaster to the wool-growers, and which has done more than any other one agency to educate the masses of the country to a determination that the system of protection which it exemplifies shall no longer be tolerated. Shortly afterward (in 1869) another combination of interests, under a plea that the miners of Northern Michigan, whose residence was mainly in Wall Street, were suffering for lack of employment, procured the enactment of a prohibitive duty on the import of copper; the result of which has been to enable the owners of a few mines of unprecedented richness, bought from the United States for a mere pittance, to divide profits, through an ability to tax the domestic consumption of copper, to an estimated amount of some thirty millions of dollars on an original investment of a few hundred thousand of capital.

That the war tariff would be speedily revised and reduced after the revision of the internal revenue system had been accomplished and its taxes on domestic manufactures practically abolished no one doubted; or if any doubts were entertained, they were not publicly expressed. The general idea was that when the work of revision was once formally undertaken, the rates, so far as the necessities of the Government for revenue would permit, should be made to approximate those that were in force before the war. Such were the sentiments of the leading Republican members of Congress: Messrs. Fessenden, Grimes,¹ Trumbull, Wilson, Sumner, and Foster, of the Senate; of Garfield, Allison, Wilson (of Iowa), and Kasson, H. J. Raymond, and

¹ In September, 1867, Senator Grimes, of Iowa (who at that time was an earnest advocate of radical tariff reform), in a letter to the Burlington "Hawkeye," stated: "I believe that four-fifths of the members of the Republican party in Iowa are in full accord with Mr. Wilson, Mr. Allison, Mr. Kasson, Governor Kirkwood, and myself, and with a majority of the members of Congress from the Northwestern States, on the subject of the tariff." And the New York "Tribune," in commenting on the letter of Senator Grimes, said: "We will unite with him in maintaining the right of every Republican to be a Protectionist or Free-trader, as he shall see fit; no man is the less a Republican for any opinion he may cherish on questions of political economy."

Logan, of the House; of the Democratic members of both branches and of the then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McCulloch. General Garfield on principle was a radical free-trader, but on the ground of expediency he held that free trade in the United States could be best and most speedily attained through natural and tentative reforms; his exact language being: "I believe in free trade reached through protection; I believe in protection leading to free trade"; and he probably fully accepted the definition of Canning that "true statesmanship consisted in finding the line of safe change." In private and familiar conversation his logic and his wit were always antagonistic to the theory of protective duties, and one illustration of the latter is to be found in his remark that the assumption that the prosperity and wonderful development of the United States were due mainly to the influence of high and restrictive taxation, found a parallel in the experience of the shipwrecked sailors who, after landing on what they supposed to be a desolate island and seeing a gallows in the distance, thanked God that they had come to a civilized land. General Garfield was among the very first of citizens of the United States who accepted (in 1869) membership in the Cobden Club, and he was associated in so doing with Charles Sumner, R. W. Emerson, W. C. Bryant, H. W. Longfellow, William Lloyd Garrison, H. W. Beecher, Charles Francis Adams, and Amasa Walker; all of whom would probably have agreed with the late Dr. Leonard Bacon that the best warrant for accepting the principle of free trade was to be found in the eighth commandment—"Thou shalt not steal."

After, however, the work of revision had been entered upon, and a complete tariff bill with very moderate reductions, prepared under the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, had passed the Senate, and would have passed the House except for an inability to take it out of the Committee of the Whole at the close of a short session by a two-thirds vote, the extreme protection sentiment organized with a view of preventing any reduction in the war tariff, and under the inspiration largely of Henry C. Carey, of Philadelphia, and led mainly by representatives of the iron and steel interests of Pennsylvania and of the wool-growers of Ohio, became fiercely aggressive. Its first action was practically to serve notice upon every Republican member of Congress or aspirant for Congressional service that his political prospects would be imperilled by any opposition in the way of action, or expression of opinion, to a continuance of a high protective policy, or in favor of what they were pleased to term "free trade"; although

the most extreme results known to be within the possibility of attainment in that direction at that time and for a long future were a return to the tariff rates of the immediate ante-war period. And under such an influence a majority of the prominent members of the Republican party in Congress and out of Congress, who had before advocated tariff reform, became protectionists and often violent advocates of a policy that they had once earnestly repudiated. It will doubtless be said in defence of such changes that they were the result of larger information and consequent better judgment, and ought not to be subject to harsher criticism than the every-day changes in theological opinions, as from Puritanism to Episcopacy or from Unitarianism to Catholicism. But such a comparison is not warranted. In the case of the theological changes referred to, the fundamental principles of religious belief are not abandoned. But for a man of conceded intelligence, who has once recognized that the denial to any individual, for the benefit of some private interest, of the right freely to exchange the product of his labor, involves the principle of slavery, for such a one to at once wholly repudiate this great moral and economic axiom and hold that the artificial restriction of exchanges is conducive in the highest degree to the development of the state and the prosperity of its citizens, is a good deal like the abandonment of the Christian faith and gospel for the faith and gospel of Joe Smith. Certainly it would be difficult to see how any plea could be offered in justification of such changes that would not be a reflection either upon one's intelligence or integrity. And in this connection a reference to some specific and notable experiences may be pertinent.

Thus General Hawley (a present Senator of the United States from Connecticut) is on record as an attendant at meetings of the American Free Trade League in 1867-68 and also as a participant in a convention of tariff-reformers and free-traders in Washington in April, 1870, which ultimately resulted in the calling of the celebrated convention at Cincinnati in 1872. And yet this same gentleman is reported as having in 1890, in a speech in the Senate, expressed the opinion that commerce was a "rotten" trade, and that if the United States could be surrounded by a Chinese wall for a lengthened period its people would be greatly benefited; and as having asserted in the recent Presidential campaign that "free trade is the surviving partner of slavery"; to which the Boston "Journal" added that "truer and more timely words could not have been uttered by an American statesman."

Another more extraordinary example of changes in economic opin-

ions of an earlier date, and which hitherto has almost escaped attention, is afforded in the case of the late Henry C. Carey, who, as is well known, is regarded as almost the originator of the theory of protection as taught by Pennsylvania and advocated by Mr. McKinley, and stands in relation to it very much as the prophet Mohammed does to the religion of Islam. In early life, however, and before he had a pocket interest in Pennsylvania coal lands, he was a good deal of a liberal; and in at least two publications, which intentionally or otherwise have long disappeared from circulation, he advanced some of the most clear and unanswerable arguments in favor of free trade that have been advanced by any writer of repute on this subject. In his "Past, Present, and Future," published in 1848, he thus characterized the whole system of indirect taxation which constitutes not only the corner-stone, but the entire foundation of every protective tariff:

"The whole system is mere petty larceny. It is an attempt to filch that which cannot be openly demanded. It is one of those inventions of man by which the few are enabled to grow rich at the expense of the many, and is therefore greatly favored by that class of men who prefer living by the labor of others to living by their own. The man who plunders a city is of the same species with the highway robber. The man who imposes indirect taxes is of the same species with the *chevalier d'industrie*. All belong to the genus of great men, all are equally destitute of manly or generous feeling. The plunderer of cities selects those who are weak and defenceless, and the collector of indirect taxes selects those commodities used by poor men who cannot defend themselves. Where the system most prevails men are most weak and cheap, and food most dear."

And continuing his discussion, he makes a forecast that wonderfully corresponds to the present economic condition of the United States:

"So long as it [indirect taxation] shall be permitted to exist, the system of large revenues to be squandered by those who live by managing the affairs of others must continue. So long as it exists, the planters and farmers must continue to give a large portion of their small product in exchange for a small quantity of clothing. So long as it exists, every attempt at the establishment of freedom of trade must be a failure. With its correction every obstacle to the establishment of perfect freedom will disappear and the tariff will pass out of existence. So long as the present system shall continue, trade of every kind must be subject to violent fluctuations which enable the few to enrich themselves at the expense of the many and enable gambling speculators to live in palaces and ride in coaches by aid of indirect taxation levied upon the hard-working mechanic and honest farmer ruined by changes in the value of their property."

Again, in a treatise "On Wealth," published in 1838, Mr. Carey adverts to an opinion (then) recently expressed by Mr. J. R. MacCul-

loch, an English economist, to the effect that moderate taxation was advantageous as a spur to exertion, and comments on it as follows:

“This view of the subject is calculated to produce great error. The moment we admit that taxation in *any case* tends to promote industry it is impossible to say where we shall stop. If taxation be a stimulus, the advantage must increase with its extent, and taking two shillings per week must do more good than taking one shilling. Mr. MacCulloch, however, insists that it shall be moderate; but moderation depends on habit. We think he has fallen into the same error with the man who attributes increased vigor to two glasses of brandy, while he deprecates the drinking of a quart as likely to produce intoxication. The man in sound health who drinks two glasses will not work as well as he who drinks none, but he will do so much better than his neighbors who drink the one quart that it may be supposed that his superiority results from the glasses taken, when it really arises out of the six he has forborne to take. If taxation be good so is the lash; both will make people work, but neither of them will make people work well.”

In the same connection Mr. Carey enjoins upon legislators “to recollect the following sound remarks by Sir Henry Parnell, an English economist: ‘Taxation is the price we pay for government, and every particle of expense that is incurred beyond what necessity absolutely requires for the preservation of social order and for protection against foreign attack is waste and an unjust and oppressive imposition upon the public.’” And yet this same Mr. Carey in later years went back on all his former teachings and did more than any other one man in this country to build up a school of economists whose vitality and existence have always depended on the utter renunciation of everything in the way of economic principle that its founder had originally annunciated.

A similar parallel is to be found in the case of the author of the book, “Does Protection Protect?” (published in 1871), who, starting as a protectionist, and after completing one of the most scientific and thorough statistical investigations ever instituted, was led to the conclusion that “the best protection for industry was to let it alone,” and that “human wisdom cannot better, by artificial laws, the conditions under which the Creator has placed human labor by the natural laws of exchange,” and who has since done his best to prove to the public that the views as above expressed by him were entirely erroneous.

The sentiments of the protectionists of the United States during the last twenty-five years in their controversy with the friends of commercial freedom may be fitly characterized as “ferocious.” From the outset it has been assumed that every advocate of free trade or tariff reform was necessarily dishonest and an enemy to the country and its

industries. In an interview between the writer and Mr. Horace Greeley, after the nomination in 1872 of the latter for the Presidency—an interview arranged by the friends of the candidate with a purpose of conciliating the so-called “free-trade element” of the Cincinnati Convention—the conversation was opened by a remark by Mr. Greeley that he “did not believe there was but one honest free-trader in the country, and that was Mr. Horace White,” then editor of the Chicago “Tribune.” Of course, after an introductory remark so flattering to the person with whom he had sought to confer, the conversation did not continue, and Mr. Greeley, falling back in his chair, soon peacefully went to sleep. The origin of this sentiment, *i.e.*, of dishonesty on the part of tariff-reformers, may undoubtedly be traced back to the circumstance that the possessors of privilege of every kind, and more especially of privilege conferred by a tariff, come after a time to regard any advantage thereby accruing to them as in the nature of personal property and any attack upon it as unwarranted spoliation or robbery; whereas, the facts and inference are entirely the reverse, inasmuch as it is inconsistent with the principles of a free government to grant special privileges to anybody or for any purpose except to promote the efficiency or dignity of its administration.

The allegation that the friends of commercial freedom in the United States were corrupted and influenced by the recipience of British gold—probably first started by Mr. Carey and at once taken up and reiterated by Horace Greeley and the protectionist press and orators generally—has undoubtedly obtained extensive popular credit and been a potent political factor, first, because the masses were unwilling to believe that men and journals of position and reputation would persistently identify themselves with an untruth; and, secondly, because when observation showed that the advocacy of high protection was a prime condition for the obtaining of office and often of large wealth also, the masses found it difficult to believe that any one would willingly forego such advantages, and accept in return for much of personal sacrifice, much of personal abuse and ridicule, and all for an idea that no man should be deprived of any attribute of personal liberty merely because it was for the personal or pocket interest of some other man that he should be. The medium through which this “British gold” has been distributed has been generally believed to be the Cobden Club, of England; although it is a fact that this club has never in the course of its existence contributed as much as one cent in money to any person or organization in the United States for

the purpose of promoting tariff reform or free trade, or has endeavored to influence public opinion in favor of its creed of "Free Trade, Peace and Good Will to Men" in any other way than by public utterance or publications, of which last it has never distributed in the aggregate as many as the American Iron and Steel Association has printed and sent forth in a single year in favor of restricted trade, national antagonisms, and private interests. Had the protection-and-free-trade controversy which has been carried on in the United States for the last twenty-five years occurred in the sixteenth century, with the protectionists in control of the powers of the state, there can be little doubt, as human nature has been pretty much the same in all ages, that the axe, the stake, the gibbet, and the prison would have been as freely employed in antagonizing liberty to trade as they were formerly in antagonizing liberty of religious belief; and that they really followed the precedents of the sixteenth century as far as the changed conditions of civilization in the nineteenth would admit, finds the following illustrations: If all the facts could be told it would be found that many men—especially young men—in recent years have had presented to them the alternatives of absolute abstention from all expression or action in favor of commercial freedom, or failure in business, or opportunity for employment, and in most instances under fear of prospective want have accepted the former; and this undoubtedly explains in a great degree the falling off of the Republican vote in nearly every commercial and manufacturing district of the country where the Australian or secret ballot has been established. Organizations for public lectures have adopted in many instances a rule to invite no man prominently identified with the cause of free trade to address them on any other subject, no matter how well qualified he may be to do so; and the doors of halls freely open to public entertainments of doubtful morality have been closed (as was the case in the last national election in New England) to applicants desirous of explaining to the people the principles of tariff reform. These efforts to prevent free speech have been contemporaneous with efforts to darken reason with prejudice in furtherance of the protective policy, as is illustrated by the preparation and use of forged or fictitious extracts from the London "Times," or from the columns of non-existent foreign journals with high-sounding names, and the persistent circulation of such extracts after their entire falsity had been exposed. This was the case with one of the most noted of these instrumentalities, of which some two million card copies were circulated in the Presi-

dential campaign of 1888 without protest from any protectionist paper, after its originator, the Secretary of the New England Home-Market Club, had confessed that it was a forgery.

Other influences which have greatly aided to maintain the protective policy in the United States are too well recognized to require any extended comment. And under all these circumstances, it is no wonder that commercial freedom in recent years has appeared to find little favor with the American people. But it is clear nevertheless that the plain people have of late done a good deal of plain thinking, and in the recent national election have expressed in the most surprising, but unmistakable manner, a determination that at least the extreme protective policy shall no longer be tolerated. And the question of paramount interest at present with these same people is, What is to come of their action?

As might have been expected, any anticipated reconstruction of the tariff having in view any reduction of the taxes on imports has been productive of prophecies of consequent national disaster. These have ever been the accompaniment of every extension of rational liberty, and in no instance have such prophecies been fulfilled. It was so when Sir Robert Peel instituted the first measures of tariff reform and abolished the "corn laws," and British commerce thenceforth increased by leaps and bounds, imports rising from \$906,000,000 in 1841 to \$3,700,000,000 in 1890. It was so when Great Britain in 1849 repealed her antiquated navigation laws and Mr. Disraeli arose in his place in the House of Commons and declared that such action "endangered the [British] empire of the seas"; and to-day Great Britain owns more than seven-twelfths of the world's ocean shipping and seventy per cent of the world's steam-tonnage. It was so in 1884 when the New York "Tribune" predicted that "Democratic victory would mean the failure of thousands of establishments, loss of work, and great suffering to millions of families," and when such victory was achieved nothing of the kind happened. That the country may experience something of disturbance consequent on the practical work of tariff reform is not improbable. It should not, however, escape attention that such disturbances, if they occur, are rightfully chargeable to the ingrained vices of past economic and financial profligacy and not to the struggle for economic and financial reform. All reformation is a painful process, but let the pain be credited to the old vices and not to the new virtues. There is much,

furthermore, to indicate that if the work of tariff reform is intelligently conducted any possible resulting disturbances will be reduced to a very small minimum. If every custom-house in the land was closed and perfect free trade established, not more than five dollars' worth in every hundred of our agricultural products, or ten dollars' worth in every hundred of our manufactured products, could be imported; and it is also probable that under a "tariff for revenue only" any consequent displacement of labor from old occupations would be more than compensated for by the opening of new industries contingent on free crude materials and freedom of exchange. The experience of the country under the low-tariff policy that prevailed from 1847 to 1860 is exceedingly instructive on this point and, very curiously, has hitherto attracted comparatively little attention. The so-called "Walker tariff" reduced the average rate of duties on dutiable imports to twenty-five and one-half per cent, and this average was further reduced in 1857 to twenty per cent. The result was that the aggregate of our foreign commerce—exports and imports—increased thirty-seven per cent the very first year, and notwithstanding the disturbing influence of two wars—the Mexican and the Crimean—continued to increase, until in 1860 the increase over 1846 was in excess of two hundred per cent, an increase far greater than any corresponding increase in national wealth or population. During this great increase of our exports and imports, moreover, our exports of *manufactured* in contradistinction to *agricultural* products increased at a rate never before or since equalled. Is there any reason why under like conditions like results will not be realized?

A return to the conditions of a much lower tariff than is now in force would, furthermore, seem to be the only avenue open to the country for escape from a large measure of calamity. The most surprising theory about the recent national election was not the large majority for the Democratic candidate, but that the Populist or "Farmers' Alliance" party, seeking the suffrage of the American people on a platform of principles for the most part utterly antagonistic to the world's economic and financial ideas and experiences, and which if adopted would radically change the character of the Government, should have carried four States and obtained twenty-two electoral votes. The explanation of such a result is to be found in the dissatisfaction and poverty of the agricultural population of the country, who in the aggregate nearly equal all those engaged in all other occupations, because of an inability to sell the products of their labor at remunerative prices.

And as recurring years bring them no prospect of obtaining the same, they are becoming disheartened even to the point of desperation and are ready to listen to every demagogue and crank who promise them relief through unlimited issues of cheap money, irredeemable paper, or depreciated silver, with which they can pay their debts, or loans from the Government at nominal rates of interest secured by the deposit of their crops in government warehouses. Hence the origin of the "Farmers' Alliance" party, which but for the "Force" bill and the fear of Negro domination would have changed the political situation in the recent election in more than one Southern State, and which, if some relief is not soon given to the farming population of the country, bids fair ultimately to destroy both the old parties in many States.

But whence is relief to come? Is the inability of the American agriculturists to sell their products at remunerative prices due to their production of things which the world does not want? On the contrary, their products are what the world most wants. The Secretary of Agriculture has recently stated that there are 150,000,000 people in Europe who never eat wheaten bread, and other protectionist orators tell us, and probably with truth, that there are more than 150,000,000 Europeans who never eat meat more than twice a week. Is this because these poor people do not want bread or meat? Not at all. All of them would be glad of all that they can get. They are hindered in their desires by their poverty, and their poverty in turn is caused mainly by their inability to find customers for the things which they produce. Open markets for their products by removing the shackles which our present tariff policy imposes on international trade-exchanges, and they in turn will furnish boundless markets for American products. Deny relief by continuing the present restrictive commercial policy, and the maximum of evil which the protected manufacturing interests of the country can anticipate from radical free trade, will be as nothing in comparison with what they are likely to experience in consequence of bad money, disordered national finances, discriminating income taxes, and governmental interference with the whole machinery of domestic exchanges.

How the natural instincts, moreover, of the American people continually prompt to an enlargement of our international trade, is proved by the fact that we cannot build a tariff wall so high and so thick as to prevent the constant increase of our imports; their aggregate for 1889 having been greater than in 1888, and since then, and notwithstanding the influence of the McKinley act, their increase has been

greater every year, and for the present fiscal year bids fair to be the greatest in our history. Another and perhaps more striking illustration is to be found in the fact that although the United States and Canada have united in building up a double tariff wall, one on one side of the border and the other on the other side, which all trade between the two countries has got to climb over, yet nearly one-half the entire trade of Canada is carried on with the United States.

A reference to a constant feature of the tariff controversy in the United States in recent years may also help to the formation of an opinion as to results of impending tariff reductions. It has always been asserted by the advocates of protection that England was most desirous that the United States should adopt a free-trade policy, and therefore, on the principle that it is not wise to conform to the wishes of one's competitors, it is argued that it would be most impolitic for the United States to do so. But the fact is that not a few of the best economists and business men of England, including some of the most prominent members of the Cobden Club, have long held to the opinion that nothing could be so likely to impair the present manufacturing and commercial supremacy of Great Britain, as the adoption of a free-trade policy by the United States; and in a recent letter, one of the most sagacious members of the House of Commons and an earnest advocate of free trade writes as follows:

"Our people have received the news of Cleveland's election very sulkily. The protectionists here imagine that this change of politics in the States will have a much greater effect on opinions generally in Europe than ours on questions of the same kind, and there are very many of our manufacturers who believe that the advantage which free trade will bring to the States will make them much more formidable competitors for us in all neutral markets than they are now."

It is obvious that no intelligent reconstruction of the existing tariff can be attempted without a clear understanding of the fiscal condition of the Government or the present and prospective relation of national receipts and expenditures. This has already been worked out by a private citizen in a way that practically leaves nothing for the National Treasury to do except to endorse it. At first thought it would seem as if the present enormous and increasing expenditures on account of pensions would constitute an insuperable obstacle in the way of any reduction of tariff taxes. But this obstacle can be readily overcome by regarding this pension obligation as a debt, the payment of which, as in the case of any other debt, need not be made contin-

gent on current revenues, and which may be easily met in case of temporary deficiencies of revenue, by an authorization of Treasury notes bearing a low rate of interest, issued and redeemable at the pleasure of the Government. That there may be no necessity for the issue of any such notes, or at least for their employment to any large amount, will appear if a fact is recognized which the public as yet do not seem to have fully appreciated, namely, that the receipts from internal revenue (mainly from spirits and tobacco) and miscellaneous sources—estimated for the fiscal year 1893 at \$185,000,000 and for 1894 at \$195,000,000—are nearly sufficient to provide for all the *ordinary* expenses of the Government (estimated for 1893 at \$197,000,000) except the interest on the public debt; and that it would be difficult to frame a tariff which would be acceptable to the Fifty-third Congress that would yield less than \$130,000,000 the first year, with a certainty of a large and continuing increase in the immediately succeeding years. And if, as reported, the annual expenditure for pensions proper is at present only about \$120,000,000, and the difference between the amount and current disbursement is represented by arrears which will probably be entirely liquidated in the next two years, the necessity for the use of the proposed Treasury notes would be comparatively inconsiderable.

The proposition that the work of reconstructing the tariff should be intrusted to a revenue commission is not entitled to serious consideration. It implies delay and is not necessary; all the information requisite is ready to hand or can be readily obtained. The work of drafting the bill for submission to, or ratification by, Congress ought to be performed in the first instance by the Treasury Department of the administration (as it would be in all other countries), which can call to its assistance experts in Congress and out of Congress. The somewhat popular idea that in constructing a tariff the rates should in all cases be made compensatory of the advantages accruing to other countries by reason of differences in their rates of wages, is one easy to talk about, but difficult of intelligent appreciation, for the reason that there is no common unit of such differences. Hitherto the problem has apparently been met by adopting as a unit the minimum of wages in any country having commercial relations with the United States. It may be instructive, furthermore, to note in connection with this subject, that in nearly all civilized countries, with the exception of the United States, the intensity of demand for protection against foreign industrial competition, is proportionate to a low

standard of wages and long hours of labor. Another somewhat popular idea that finds little warrant in experience is, that revenues can be increased to meet deficiency by increasing the taxes; and with this view a proposition is understood to have received the endorsement of the United States Commissioner of Internal Revenue that, in connection with a revision of the tariff, the present tax of ninety cents per gallon on distilled spirits should be increased to one dollar and twenty-five cents or more per gallon. All experience, however, absolutely proves that when taxes are imposed on any product equal to or largely in excess of its first cost of production, a temptation to fraud is created which human nature as ordinarily constituted is not able to resist. The best comment on the influence of the present tax in the United States of ninety cents (or more than five hundred per cent) per gallon on distilled spirits, is found in the circumstance that, during the year 1891, seven hundred and ninety-five stills were seized or destroyed by the United States Internal Revenue officials, and that more distillers and distillery warehouses were under the supervision of the Federal Government in 1891 in the five thinly settled States of Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, Virginia, and Ohio than are probably controlled by the governments of Great Britain and the leading states of Continental Europe.

One prime object in any prospective reconstruction of the existing tariff should be a simplification of its provisions as a revenue instrumentality. One who has not studied the subject can hardly realize the difficulties in the way of transacting business in the United States contingent on the complications and obscurities which have characterized our tariff policy for the last quarter of a century, and many of which have been intentionally created with a view of indirectly restricting foreign commerce, or, what is the same thing, obtaining higher protection through higher taxes, to a greater degree than public opinion would have sanctioned if attempted directly. Consider the situation of the British and American business man under the fiscal policy of their respective countries. The former goes to his business of any description every morning without a thought that anything of disturbance is likely to come to his industrial or commercial interests from Parliamentary legislation, for the tax system of Great Britain—the best in the world—is so simple and so well adapted to every fiscal exigency that any radical modification of it is hardly within the bounds of possibility. To the American business man, on the other hand, the session of the Federal Congress has become a period of apprehension

of the enactment of laws affecting his interests, and only those familiar with the situation can have any correct idea of the number of persons who annually gather at Washington, and the amount of money expended to effect or defeat changes in national fiscal legislation. A question which may here suggest itself is: Why not, then, accept the present tariff, and why advocate a policy that will involve further continued and radical disturbances? A sufficient answer to it is, that the existing tariff is in a condition of unstable equilibrium, as every tariff necessarily must be that is founded, as is now the case, on the claims of private interest rather than on considerations of public welfare, and that the element of stability cannot possibly inhere in it if the Government is to remain free and democratic. What an illustration of the truth of this assertion is to be found in the fact that since the enactment of the McKinley tariff, or within the last two years, there have been 100,235 cases of dispute between merchants and Treasury officials, accompanied by formal protest or appeals respecting the construction or meaning of the law or the evidence of fraud! It is true that very many of these are settled by a single court decision; but every one of them nevertheless represents worry, the employment of legal counsel, and a large expenditure of time and money on the part of the merchant. Under the tariff in force in 1890, a committee of the United States Senate reported that "the calendar of customs suits in the district (courts) of New York had grown so large that there is no reasonable prospect of disposing of them in this generation." Such a state of things, which is equivalent to a denial of justice to the merchant, does not exist in any other commercial country, and its continuance in the United States is an outrage and a reflection on its civilization.

An exceedingly high tariff on dutiable imports, averaging forty-six per cent in the aggregate and exceeding one hundred per cent in the case of not a few specific articles, has constituted such an inducement to fraudulent importation that the creation of an Administration Board endowed with extraordinary privileges, as the power to decide cases without notice to the party in controversy with the Government, has been thought necessary, and this, too, under a law so crudely drawn that the repeal of one entire section of it has been asked by the Secretary of the Treasury on the ground that it is impossible of execution. Under a tariff clearly constructed and for revenue only, the inducements for smuggling would be so far diminished that there would be no necessity for the continuance of any such law, and with

its repeal its administrators, who appear to have been actuated with the idea that foreign commerce is a crime and that importers have no rights which the Government is bound to respect, should be relegated to private life as expeditiously as possible. Concerning the average rate of duty that should be the object in a reconstruction of the tariff, there will be doubtless some differences in opinion; but excepting the duties on wines, liquors, tobacco, and a few other articles, such an average ought not to exceed twenty-five per cent *ad valorem*; and with raw and crude materials exempt from taxation, it will be found that such an average rate in many cases will afford a more ample net protection to domestic manufacturers than they now have under the existing tariff. If it be objected that such an average would not be sufficiently productive of revenue, reference may be made to the lesson of experience afforded by the results of the Walker tariff of 1846, the average rate of which was about twenty-five per cent. In the first two years after its enactment the customs revenue increased nineteen per cent, and in the first eight years it more than doubled. Is there any reason why a like experience may not be expected and realized?

If it be further objected that such an increase in the customs revenue would imply an increase in imports prejudicial to domestic industry, it may be replied that for every dollar's worth of the product of foreign industry imported, another dollar's worth of the products of American industry would be exported, and, furthermore, every dollar of the latter would embody a profit—large in the case of the products of agriculture—or the business of international exchanging would not be extensively prosecuted.

A reconstruction of the tariff on substantially the lines indicated would be an era in civilization. It would do much to promote peace and good-will between the United States and the rest of the world, in place of the fear, hatred, and distrust which all other nations, with the possible exception of autocratic and semi-barbarous Russia, now entertain toward this country. It would do much toward breaking down the protective-tariff system of Europe, which now makes contiguous states hostile, and is essential to the continuance of a military system that impoverishes their people. Whether the representatives of the Democratic party in Congress assembled will courageously and intelligently fulfil the mission intrusted to them by the American people remains to be seen. But it is certain their pathway to success is not along the line of timid conservatism.

DAVID A. WELLS.

THE ART OF WRITING HISTORY.

I do not propose in this paper to enter into any general inquiry about the best method of writing history. Such inquiries appear to me to be of no real value, for there are many different kinds of history which should be written in many different ways. A diplomatic, a military, or a parliamentary history, dealing with a short period or a particular episode, must evidently be treated in a very different spirit from an extended history where the object of the historian should be to describe in their due proportion and relief the various aspects of the national life, and to trace through long periods of time the ultimate causes of national progress and decay. The history of religion, of art, of literature, of social and industrial development, of scientific progress, have all their different methods. A writer who treats of some great revolution that has transformed human affairs should deal largely in retrospect, for the most important part of his task is to explain the long course of events that prepared and produced the catastrophe; while a writer who treats of more normal times will do well to plunge rapidly into his theme.

There are some fields of history where the primary facts are so little known, so much contested, or so largely derived from recondite manuscript sources that a faithful historian will be obliged, in justice to his readers, to sacrifice both proportion and artistic charm to the supreme necessity of sifting evidence and accumulating proofs, while in other departments the gift of portraiture and the gift of generalization play the largest parts. Historians, too, differ widely in their special talents, and these talents are never altogether combined. The power of vividly realizing and portraying men, or societies, or modes of thought that have long since passed away; the power of arranging and combining great multitudes of various facts; the power of judging with discrimination, accuracy, and impartiality conflicting arguments or evidence; the power of tracing through the long course of events the true chain of cause and effect, selecting the facts that are most valuable and significant and explaining the relation between general causes and particular effects, are all very different and belong to different types of mind. It is idle to expect a writer with the gifts of a

Clarendon, a Kinglake, or a Froude to write history in the spirit of a Hallam or a Grote. Writers who are eminently distinguished for wide, patient, and accurate research have sometimes little power either of describing or interpreting the facts which they collect. All that can be said with any profit is that each writer will do best if he follows the natural bent of his genius, and that he should select those kinds or periods of history in which his special gifts have most scope and the qualities in which he is deficient are least needed.

The supreme virtue of the historian is truthfulness, and it may be violated in many different degrees. The worst form is when a writer deliberately falsifies facts or deliberately excludes from his picture qualifying circumstances. But there are other and much more subtle ways in which party spirit continually and often quite unconsciously distorts history. All history is necessarily a selection of facts, and a writer who is animated by a strong sympathy with one side of a question or a strong desire to prove some special point will be much tempted in his selection to give an undue prominence to those that support his view, or, even where neither facts nor arguments are suppressed, to give a party character to his work by an unfair distribution of lights and shades. The strong and vivid epithets are chiefly reserved for the good or bad deeds on one side, the vague, general, and comparatively colorless epithets for the corresponding deeds on the other side; and in this way very similar facts are brought before the reader with such different degrees of illumination and relief that they make a wholly different impression on his mind. In the history of Macaulay this defect may, I think, be especially traced. The characteristic defect of that great and in most respects admirable writer, both as historian and artist, was the singular absence of graduation in his mind. The neutral tints which are essential to the accurate shading of character seemed almost wanting, and a love of strong contrasted lights and shades, coupled with his supreme command of powerful epithets, continually misled him. But no attentive reader can fail to observe how unequally these epithets are distributed and how clearly this inequality discloses the strong bias under which he wrote.

The truth of an historical picture lies mainly in its judicious and accurate shading, and it is this art which the historian should especially cultivate. He will scarcely do so with success unless it becomes to him not merely a matter of duty, but also a pleasure and a pride. The kind of interest which he takes in his narrative should be much less that of a politician and an advocate than of a painter, who, now dark-

ening and now lightening the picture, seeks by many delicate touches to catch with exact fidelity the tone and hue of the object he represents. One of the most valuable of all forms of historical imagination is that which enables a writer to place himself in the point of view of the best men on different sides and to bring out the full force of opposing arguments.

The degree of certainty that it is possible to attain in history varies greatly in different departments. The growth of institutions and laws, military events, changes in manners and in creeds, can be described with much confidence, and although it is more difficult to depict the inner moral life of nations, the influences that form their characters and prepare them for greatness or decay, yet when the materials for our induction are sufficiently large this field of history may be studied with great profit. Diplomatic history and the more secret springs of political history can only be fully disclosed when the archives relating to them have been explored and when the confidential correspondence of the chief actors in them has been published. The biographical element in history is always the most uncertain. Even among contemporaries the judgment of character and motives depends largely on indications so slight and subtle that they rarely pass into books and are only fully felt by direct personal contact, and the smallest knowledge of life shows how quickly anecdotes and sayings are distorted, colored, and misplaced when they pass from lip to lip. Most of the "good sayings" of history are invention, and most of them have been attributed to different persons. A history which is plainly written under the influence of party bias has the value of an advocate's speech giving one side of the question. When our only materials for the knowledge of a period are derived from such histories, the saying of Voltaire should be remembered—that we can confidently believe only the evil which a party writer tells of his own side and the good which he recognizes in his opponents. In judging the historian we must consider his nearness to the events he relates, his probable means of information, and the internal evidence in his narrative of accuracy, honesty, and judgment, and we must also consider the standard of proof and the methods of historical writing prevailing in his time. A modern writer who placed in the mouths of his personages speeches which he himself invented would be justly discredited, but in antiquity it was a recognized custom for a historian to embody in fictitious speeches the reflections suggested by his narrative and the motives which he believed to have actuated his heroes.

Different ages differ enormously in the severity of proof which they exact, in the degree of accuracy which they attain. The credibility of a statement also depends not only on the amount of its evidence, but also on its own inherent probability. Every one will feel that an amount of testimony that would be quite sufficient to persuade him that a butcher's boy had been seen driving along a highway is wholly different from that which would be required to persuade him that a ghost had been met there. The same rule applies to the history of the past, and it is complicated by the great difference in different ages of the measure of probability, or, in other words, by the strong predisposition in certain stages of knowledge to accept statements or explanations of facts which in later stages we know to be incredible or in a high degree improbable. Few subjects in history are more difficult than the laws of evidence in dealing with the supernatural and the extent to which the authority of historians in relating credible and probable facts is invalidated by the presence of a mythical element in their narratives.

Connected with this subject is also the question how far it is possible by merely internal evidence to decompose an ancient document, resolving it into its separate elements, distinguishing its different dates and its different degrees of credibility. The reader is no doubt aware with what a rare skill this method of inquiry has been pursued in the present century, chiefly by great German and Dutch scholars, in dealing with the early Jewish writings. At the same time, without disputing the value of their work or the importance of many of the results at which they have arrived, I may be pardoned for expressing my belief that this kind of investigation is often pursued with an exaggerated confidence. Plausible conjecture is too frequently mistaken for positive proof. Undue significance is attached to what may be mere casual coincidences, and a minuteness of accuracy is professed in discriminating between the different elements in a narrative which cannot be attained by mere internal evidence. In all writings, but especially in the writings of an age when criticism was unknown, there will be repetitions, contradictions, inconsistencies and diversities of style which do not necessarily indicate different authorship or dates.

I have spoken of the uncertainty of the biographical element in history. It must, however, be said that when a historian is dealing with men who have played a very prominent part on the stage of life, the general acceptance of his judgment is a strong corroboration of its truth. It may be added that the later judgment of men is not infre-

quently more true than the contemporary judgment. The wisdom of a teaching or of a policy is shown by its results, and these results are in most cases very gradually disclosed. Great men are like great mountains which are surrounded by lower peaks that often obscure their grandeur and seem to a near observer to equal or even to overtop them. It is only when seen from far off that their true dimensions are fully realized and they soar to heaven above all rivals. In the page of history men are judged mainly by the net result of their lives, by the broad lines of their characters and achievements. Many injudicious words, many minor weaknesses of conduct, are forgotten. Faults of manner, deficiencies of tact, awkwardnesses of appearance, which tell so largely upon the judgments of contemporaries, are no longer seen. The conversational nimbleness and versatility of intellect, the charm or assurance or magnetism of manner, the weight of social position, all of which tend to secure to an inferior man a preëminence in the circle in which he moves, are equally evanescent, and the shy, rugged, and tactless recluse often emerges on the strength of his genuine and abiding performances to a position in the eyes of the world which he never attained during his lifetime.

That fine saying of Cardan, "*Tempus mea possessio, tempus ager meus*," might be the motto of the historian. Time is the field which he cultivates, and a true sense of space and distance should be one of the chief characteristics of his work. Few things are more difficult to attain than a just perspective in history. The most dramatic incidents are not the most important, and in weighing the joys and sorrows of the past our measures of judgment are almost hopelessly false. The most humane man cannot emancipate himself from the law of his nature, according to which he is more affected by some tragic circumstance which has taken place in his own house or in his own street than by a catastrophe which has carried anguish and desolation over enormous areas in a distant continent. In history, too, there are vast tracts which are almost necessarily unrealized. We judge a period mainly by its great men, by its brilliant or salient incidents, by the fortunes of a small class, and the great mass of obscure, suffering, inarticulate humanity, whose happiness is often so profoundly affected by political and military events, almost escapes our notice. It should be the object of history to bring before us past events in their true proportion and significance, and one of the greatest improvements in modern history is the increased attention which is paid to the social, industrial, and moral history of the poor. The paucity of our infor-

mation and the difficulty of realizing the conditions of obscure multitudes will always make this branch of history very imperfect, but it is one of the most essential to the just judgment of the past.

Another task which lies before the historian is that of distinguishing proximate from ultimate causes. Our first natural impulse is to attribute a great change to the men who effected it and to the period in which it took place, and to neglect or underrate the long train of causes which had been, often through many generations, preparing its advent. A faithful historian must especially guard against this error. He must study the slow process of growth as well as the moment of efflorescence, the long progress of decay as well as the final catastrophe. He will probably find that the part played by statesmen and legislatures is less than he had imagined, and that the causes of the movements he relates must be sought over a wider area and through a longer period. It is at present the fashion with some writers to treat history as if it ought to consist mainly of an investigation of state-paper offices. It is quite right that the treasure-houses of diplomatic correspondence which have of late years been thrown open should be explored and sifted, but history written chiefly from these materials is not likely to be distinguished either by artistic charm or philosophic value. Those who are immersed in these studies are very apt to overrate their importance and the part which diplomacy and statesmanship have borne in the great movement of human affairs.

A more fatal and very common error is that of judging the actions of the past by the moral standard of our own age. This is especially the error of novices in history and of those who without any wide and general culture devote themselves exclusively to a single period. While the primary and essential elements of right and wrong remain unchanged, nothing is more certain than that the standard or ideal of duty is continually altering. A very humane man in another age may have done things which would now be regarded as atrociously barbarous. A very virtuous man may have done things which would now indicate extreme profligacy. We seldom indeed make sufficient allowance for the degree in which the judgments and dispositions of even the best men are colored by the moral tone of the time or society in which they live. And what is true of individuals is equally true of nations. In order to judge equitably the legislation of any people, we must always consider corresponding contemporary legislations and ideas. When this is neglected our judgments of the past become wholly false. How often, for example, has such a subject as the his-

tory of the penal laws against Irish Catholics been treated without the smallest reference to the contemporary laws against Protestants that existed in every Catholic nation and the contemporary laws against Catholics that existed in almost every Protestant country in Europe. How often have the English commercial restrictions on the American colonies been treated as if they were instances of extreme and exceptional tyranny, while a more extended knowledge would show that they were simply the expression of ideas of commercial policy and about the relation of dependencies to the mother country which then almost universally prevailed.

It is not merely the moral standard that changes. A corresponding change takes place in the moral type, or, in other words, in the class of virtues which is especially cultivated and especially valued. To know an age aright we should above all things seek to understand its ideal, the direction in which the stream of its self-sacrifice and moral energy naturally flowed. Few things in history are more interesting and more valuable than a study of the causes that produced and modified these successive ideals. Thus in the moral type of pagan antiquity the civic virtues occupied incomparably the foremost place. The idea of a supremely good man was essentially that of a man of action, of a man whose whole life was devoted to the service of his country. The life and death of Cato was for generations the favorite model. He was deemed, in the words of an old Latin historian, to be of all men the one "most like to virtue." This pattern retained its force till the softening influence of the Greek spirit, permeating Roman life, made the stoical ideal seem too hard and unsympathizing; till the corruption and despotism of the Empire had withdrawn the best men from political life and attached a certain taint or stigma to public employment; till new religions arose in the East, bringing with them new ideals to govern the world. Gradually we may trace the contemplative virtues rising to the foremost place until, about the fifth century, the ideal had totally changed. The heroic type was replaced by the saintly type. The supremely good man was now the ascetic. The first condition of sanctity was a complete abandonment of secular duties and cares and a complete subjugation of the body. A vast literature of legends arose reflecting and glorifying the prevailing ideal and holding up the hermit life as the supreme pattern of perfection, and this literature occupies a place in mediævalism very similar to that held by the "Lives" of Plutarch in antiquity.

Ancient art was essentially the glorification of the body, a repre-

sensation of the full strength and beauty of developed manhood. The saint of the mediæval mosaic represents the body in its extreme maceration and humiliation. The rhetorician, Dio Chrysostom, in a somewhat whimsical passage, which was suggested by a remark of Plato, found a special moral significance in the fact that Homer, though he places his heroes on the banks of what he calls "the fishy Hellespont," never makes them eat fish, but always flesh and the flesh of oxen, for this, as he says, is "strength-producing food" and is therefore suited for the formation of heroes and the proper diet for men of virtue. Compare this judgment with the protracted, and indeed incredible, facts which the monkish writers delighted in attributing to the saints of the desert, and we have a vivid picture of the change that has passed over the ideal.

But as time moved on the ascetic ideal gradually declined and was replaced by the very different ideal of chivalry. It consisted chiefly of three new elements. The first element was a spirit of gallantry which gave women a wholly new place in the imaginations of men. It was in part a reaction against the extreme austerity of the saints, and this reaction was much intensified after the cessation of the panic which had risen at the close of the tenth century about the approaching end of the world. It was in part produced by the softer and more epicurean civilization which grew up in the country bordering on the Pyrenees. It was especially represented in the romances and poems of the Troubadours, and the new tendency even received some assistance from the Church when the Council of Clermont, which originated the Crusades, imposed on the knight the religious obligation of defending all widows and orphans.

The second element was an increased reverence for secular rank, which grew out of the feudal system, when a great hereditary aristocracy arose and all European society was moulded into a compact hierarchy, of which the serf was the basis and the emperor the apex. The principle of subordination and obedience ran through the whole edifice, and a respect for rank was universally diffused. Men came to associate their ideal of greatness with regal or noble authority, and they were therefore prepared to idealize any great sovereign who might arise. Such a sovereign appeared in Charlemagne, who exercised upon Christendom a fascination not less powerful than that which Alexander had once exercised upon Greece, and he accordingly soon became the centre of a whole literature of romance.

The third element was the fusion of religious enthusiasm with the

military spirit. Christianity in its first phases was utterly opposed to the military spirit; but this opposition was naturally mitigated when the Church triumphed under Constantine and became associated with governments and armies. The hostility was still further qualified when many tribes of warlike barbarians embraced the faith, and the military obligation which was an essential element of feudalism acted in the same direction. But, above all, the rise and conquests of Mohammedanism awoke the military energies of Christendom and determined the direction it should take. In the Crusades the two great streams of military enthusiasm and of religious enthusiasm met, and the result was the formation of a new ideal which for a long period mainly governed the imagination of Christendom.

It for a time absorbed, eclipsed, and transformed all purely national ideals. No poet was ever more intensely English in his character and sympathies than Chaucer, and he wrote when the dazzling glories of Crécy and Poitiers were still very recent. Yet it is not on these fields, but in the long wars with the Moslems, that his pattern knight had won his renown. The military expeditions of Charlemagne were directed almost exclusively against the Saxons and against Slavonic tribes. With the Spanish Mohammedans he came but very slightly in contact. He made in person but one expedition against them, and that expedition was both insignificant and unsuccessful. But in the Karlovingian romances, which were written when the crusading enthusiasm was at its height, the figure of the great emperor underwent a strange and most significant transformation. The German wars were scarcely noticed. Charlemagne is surrounded with the special glory that ought to have belonged to Charles Martel. He is represented as having passed his entire life in a victorious struggle with the Mohammedans of Europe, and is even gravely credited with a triumphant expedition to Jerusalem. The three romances of the Crusades which are believed to be the oldest were all written by monks, and they all make Charlemagne their hero. Even geography was transformed by the new enthusiasm, and old maps sometimes represent Jerusalem as the centre of the world.

In few periods has there been so great a difference between the ideals created by the popular imagination and the realities that are recognized by history. Few wars have been accompanied by more cruelty, more outrage, and more licentiousness than the Crusades or have brought a blacker cloud of disasters in their train. Yet the idea that inspired them was a lofty one, and they were so speedily trans-

figured by the imaginations of men that in combination with the other influences I have mentioned they created an ideal which is one of the most beautiful in the history of the world. We may trace it clearly in the romances of Arthur and Charlemagne and of the "Cid," in the "Red-Cross Knight" of Tasso and Spenser, in the old ballads which paint so vividly the hero of chivalry, ever ready to draw his sword for his faith and his lady-love and in the cause of the feeble and the oppressed. The glorification of military courage and self-sacrifice which had been so prominent in antiquity was again in the ascendant, but it was combined with a new kind of honor and with a new vein of courtesy, modesty, and gentleness. When we apply the epithet "chivalrous" to a modern gentleman, this is no unmeaning term. There is even now an element in that character which may be distinctly traced to the ideal of chivalry which the Crusades made dominant in Europe.

I do not propose to follow the history of other ideals that have in turn prevailed. What I have written will, I trust, be sufficient to illustrate a kind of history which appears to me to possess much interest and value. It will show, too, that a faithful historian is very largely concerned with the fictions as well as with the facts of the past. Legends which have no firm historical basis are often of the highest historical value as reflecting the moral sentiments of their time. Nor do they merely reflect them. In some periods they contribute perhaps more than any other influence to mould and color them and to give them an enduring strength. The facts of history have been largely governed by its fictions. Great events often acquire their full power over the human mind only when they have passed through the transfiguring medium of the imagination, and men as they were supposed to be have sometimes exercised a wider influence than men as they actually were. Ideals ultimately rule the world, and each before it loses its ascendancy bequeathes some moral truth as an abiding legacy to the human race.

W. E. H. LECKY.

MEDICINE AS A CAREER.

To the young man about to choose a professional career, medicine at this time offers opportunities for the employment of the highest mental faculties, for the increase of knowledge, for usefulness to the world, and for the attainment of true happiness, such as no other profession presents. It is not meant by this to assert that it will certainly secure to its followers all or indeed any of these things, but that, given the same degree of intellect with a good preliminary education, the probabilities are that out of a thousand men taking up the study of medicine more will attain success than will do so among a similar number of young men of like character and attainments who devote themselves to theology, law, politics, or education.

What is the meaning of "success" in this connection? I call a successful career one in which the man has done good work, the best of which he was capable, work in which he was strongly interested and which in itself gave him pleasure, work done unselfishly because he believed it to be good work which ought to be done and not merely performed as a means grudgingly made use of to obtain wealth or fame or power as the real objects sought. It is a career which has secured a happy home and sufficient means to support it, although it may not have led to wealth; it has brought to its pursuer the approval and friendship of those best acquainted with his life and work, although it may not have made him famous or given him decorations or formal honors; it has made his advice valued and sought for by those who know him, although it may not have given him an executive office or made him a ruler over his fellow-men. Such a career does not protect from the afflictions and sorrows common to humanity, but it does away in a great measure with boredom and *ennui*, with weary waiting for something to turn up, and the work itself is the best resource against inevitable grief. The man who achieves such a career has not been dependent on his acquaintances for his happiness, he has not fretted and worried because his family or his friends or his associates or the state have not recognized his merit according to his conception of it, for he has acted on the principle that he exists for their benefit and that they are not merely his appendages.

In speaking of a medical career as a means of obtaining such success, the word medicine is used in its broadest sense to include the study of the phenomena of human life—disease and death—the circumstances by which these can be influenced, and the practical application of the results to prevention as well as to cure. No other profession affords such opportunities for investigation and experiment or a greater field of usefulness, and no other profession demands so much knowledge of natural science and of the laws of being. Of all men, the skilled physician stands nearest to the veil of Isis, which is becoming thinner, though it may never be lifted. To one who has a thirst for knowledge for its own sake or as a means for the benefit of others, the problems of the medicine of to-day offer peculiar attractions, for it is not that which is known, but that which is half known, mysterious, tantalizing, and which apparently might be known by special study, which attracts such a man.

In the preface to the "*Meddygon Myddfai*," a Welsh medical work dating from the thirteenth century, the scribe declares that the reason why the authors Rhiwallon and his sons "thus caused a record of their skill to be committed to writing was lest no one should be found after them so endowed with the requisite knowledge as they were." We may excuse the *naïve* vanity of these physicians in view of their desire to make their knowledge available for the general good; but there is small danger that any skilled practitioner of to-day will be troubled with the fear which beset the physicians of "*Myddfai*." The more he knows of the huge strides which have been made in recent years in our knowledge of the laws of life and of disease, the more he sees the extent of the dim, hazy, shifting outlines which yet remain to be explored, measured, and mapped out. He must be a student so long as he lives; as yet there is no visible end of the things which he does not know and ought to know and has reason to think that he might know by the expenditure of a little time and effort. Let us consider a few of the simplest examples.

We know that the cholera *bacillus* is the essential or immediate cause of Asiatic cholera; but we do not know why it was that when, the other day, von Pettenkoffer and Emmerich swallowed several millions of cholera *bacilli* and proved that these were living in their alimentary canals they did not have cholera. Was it due to the fact that the *bacilli* had their nature changed by culture, or was it due to the mysterious "*x*" which von Pettenkoffer supposed was present in Hamburg and not in Munich? We know that malaria is probably

due to a minute animal organism which has several stages of development, some of which occur while it is in the human body. But we have not yet been able to observe the growth and development of this organism outside the human body, where it probably has a different form. It may be, for instance, in a mosquito, and until we know, we have not mastered the chief problem in the important matter of practical prevention of malaria. We know that typhoid fever is caused by the poisonous products produced by a minute vegetable, the *bacillus* of typhoid; but we do not know whether this *bacillus* has one or many forms, or whether it may not under certain circumstances be developed from organisms which every man carries within his alimentary canal during adult life. Probably also the effects of this *bacillus* or of its products are modified to a considerable extent by the antecedent or coincident action of certain other *bacteria* and their products; but experiments on this point have only just been commenced. We know that the products formed by the growth of certain disease-producing *bacteria*, as, for instance, those of *anthrax* or tetanus, have the power of making an animal immune against those diseases, or, in other words, that the poison is hostile to the organisms which produce it; and this is probably about to become the basis of new and successful modes of treatment as well as of prevention of such diseases, but the amount of work yet to be done to place this on a firm scientific basis is enormous.

It is now known that the brain is not a single organ, but an aggregation of many nerve-centres, each having a more or less distinct function, although closely connected with others; that the action of some of these centres may be specially stimulated or checked either by certain products evolved by various organs and parts of the body or by certain drugs or by producing certain sensations through the channels of vision and of hearing. Thus, through the modern methods of investigation of the structure, connections, and functions of these nerve-centres, we are beginning to understand better the mental phenomena of man and their aberrations as the result of disease or of drugs or hypnotism. We have now some means of measuring the rapidity of mental action and find that "as quick as thought" is really not very quick, and we can locate certain lesions of the brain, from the external symptoms which they produce, with so much precision as to justify the surgeon in opening the skull at the point indicated and removing the cause of the trouble. Yet psychophysics and the physiology, pathology, and therapeutics of the

nervous system are branches of medicine which as yet are only in their infancy and in which there are many modes of investigation yet to be tried.

In like manner, I might indicate the possibilities, even the probabilities, that such diseases as diphtheria, hydrophobia, tetanus, rheumatism, yellow fever, and cancer will in the near future be deprived of much of their danger by the results of scientific study. I might take up each of the systems, organs, and fluids of the living body and show how the latest methods and discoveries in bacteriology, chemistry, electricity, etc., remain to be applied in research, in diagnosis, or in therapeutics with regard to them; but enough has probably been said to prove not only the variety and extent of the fields to be explored, but that they lie close at hand and are really explorable. And every new discovery widens the horizon and opens new paths. It would be easy to-day to set before each of a hundred skilled investigators a problem in physiology or pathology as yet unsolved, but probably solvable by a few years' patient labor; and each one of these students in the course of his work would undoubtedly come across a dozen other problems as side issues which would claim attention. The clergyman subscribes to certain doctrines which he is to expound and explain; the lawyer takes a proposition and collects evidence in favor of it; but the physician collects evidence first and then asks, not what it proves, but what it makes probable.

That which is unknown, but probably knowable, has, as I have said, great attractions for certain minds, and to such medicine as a career needs no other panegyric than the indication of the possibilities which it presents. The tastes of other men incline not so much to actual experiment as to the collation and comparison of the results of the experiments of others. In this, also, medicine presents at the present time peculiar attractions. Its current literature is of vast extent, and while much of this literature is worthless, much of it is suggestive, and perhaps one per cent of it is of permanent value. Now, it is this very fact that it requires search and discrimination to find what is useful that is attractive to certain minds. Just as, in the early days of California, pocket-hunting had a zest of its own which regular quartz-mill work could not give, so the man who commences a literary research for what has been reported with regard to some peculiar disease or method of treatment may take great pleasure in the search itself and be rather disappointed than otherwise if he

comes across an article in which he finds the work ably done for him. The great difficulty in this field of investigation is, for most men, the want of access to the books required.

Passing now from the pleasures of study for its own sake, which in the eyes of a few surpass all others, let us briefly consider the inducements which medicine offers as a career to the man who desires knowledge mainly as a means to an end, that end being practical utility to his fellow-men.

A professional man is defined as one who professes or announces that he is in possession of special knowledge such as the great majority of men do not have, and that he is willing to furnish the benefit of his knowledge to his fellow-men in the shape of advice or supervision of certain of their affairs. The three learned professions offer such advice and supervision with reference to men's souls, property, and bodies; but, as Mr. Evarts has remarked, the field of usefulness is more universal for medicine than it is for law or theology, since there are many who have no property to be cared for and there are some with regard to whose possession of souls there may be a question; but everybody has a body, which at times is liable to require skilled management to avoid suffering and death and to enable it to do its work, although some bodies, it must be confessed, are hardly worth preserving. Almost every one sooner or later desires the aid of the physician's special skill for himself or for his family; wealth, genius, fame, power do not specially diminish this need, nor do poverty and ignorance exempt from it. It is true that there are things more important than bodily health, that there are times and occasions when it is one's duty to undertake or persist in a mode of life which will almost certainly produce premature disability or death, and, as Dr. Allbutt says, "there is something not heroic in the mere health-hunter, the man who wanders from doctor to doctor and from land to land, not that he may do his duty the better, but that he may have an ache the less." This, however, does not make it the less necessary for physicians to supply the wants of all, trivial though they may seem to him, for each must be allowed to judge for himself as to where and how much the shoe pinches.

Consider the practical usefulness of medicine. It is not merely physical pain in individuals that is to be lessened or averted. Its results extend far beyond the man whose disability is removed, whose pain is diminished, whose death is delayed, and who is thus enabled to go on with his share of the world's work; they affect the welfare and

happiness of his family, of his associates, and, it may be, the interests of a nation, or of the world of science, of literature, or of art. It deals also with the health of cities and of nations, with great commercial interests, threatened on the one hand by epidemics and on the other by unwise and unnecessary restrictions imposed under the dictates of panic, the offspring of ignorance and cowardice, and its power and possibilities are inextricably involved in many social problems of the gravest importance to modern civilization.

The relative influences of heredity and of environment in the production of the defective, dependent, and dangerous classes of society, of the feeble-minded, the insane, the deaf-mutes, the vagrants, and the criminals, the means of preventing such production or of dealing with them after they have been produced, are all medical quite as much as they are sociological questions. It is to specially skilled physicians that the jurist looks for advice in dealing with persons whose responsibility for their actions is doubtful; the wise theologian will seek their counsel in cases of morbid conscientiousness and self-reproach, of epidemic emotional manifestations under religious influence, of alleged miracles. The professional educator, from the teacher in a common school to the head of a great university, has need of the information which the medical sciences are collecting with regard to the development of the organs of sensation, of memory, of comparison, and of judgment, which he is training for the coming generation, the men and women of the twentieth century; and with regard to the effects of variations in light, food, exercise, succession or order of studies, and many other things connected with school or college life upon the little masses of gray nerve substance which form the physical substratum of intellect, of emotions, and of morals. Whether one supposes that soul, intellect, and vital force are each distinct entities, having an existence independent of these nerve-centres, or that one or more of them are the result of the organization and function of such centres, all must admit the fact that injury to these centres modifies or prevents their manifestations. With a little change in certain cells of the cortical gray, a change which requires the use of the microscope to determine, the orator becomes speechless, the judge becomes a criminal, and the prudent man of business, the affectionate husband and father, the model citizen and pillar of the church becomes extravagant, unchaste, deceitful, and thus enters upon the first stage of a degeneration which, if unchecked, will make him a hopeless paralytic and a drivelling idiot.

In the first part of this paper has been briefly indicated the vast field of unknown and imperfectly-explored regions which belong to medicine, and from this point of view it may be supposed by some that our present knowledge is of little value. This is by no means the case. Modern medicine possesses great knowledge and power, much more in some cases than it is allowed to use, because popular opinion has not yet been educated to the point of appreciating its value. It is in the curious position of continually offering advice which, if accepted, would greatly lessen the need of the public for its services. When people are ready to obey the physician it is in many cases too late for them to have the benefit of his most valuable knowledge and skill: the tissues are already degenerated, the arteries are prematurely old, the epidemic is already raging among the people. The medicine of the future is preventive medicine, that which will foresee the evil while it is as yet afar off and take measures to avert it.

I have said that a successful career brings to its pursuer the approval and friendship of those who best know his work, and this is preëminently true of practical medicine. In some matters the wife trusts the medical man more than she does her husband, the youth comes to him in trouble concealed from his parents, and the man of business confides in him as he does not in his partner. The skilled physician becomes not only the trusted adviser in disease, but the personal friend, the one who is appealed to for sympathy in joy as well as in trouble, whose company is sought upon all occasions, whose mere personal presence brings with it assurance and comfort. Almost every reader of this paper knows some such man, in whose honesty of purpose, fidelity in keeping confidences, and readiness to undergo toil and trouble for the sake of his patients, all who know him have perfect confidence; he lives, as Mr. Bayard has said, "surrounded by an atmosphere of love and trust, holding as it were the heart-strings of a family in his hands." Sweet as are such trust and affection on the part of his patients, at least equally sweet are the confidence and friendship which come to him from those best qualified to judge of that part of his work which has been done rather for the benefit of the community, of science, and of the world than for individuals. These are, for the most part, the members of his own profession whom he has helped. Some of them may have been his immediate pupils; others, whom he may never see, have read his writings or have in other ways obtained help from his labors and express their appreciation of it in many ways. Through the respect and confidence thus

developed he becomes a well-known consultant, the man whose advice is sought by his brother-physicians in doubtful and difficult cases. This increases his experience and his influence and calls his attention to the many points in which medical science is still defective; for too often when he sees the case he can but recognize its incurability and offer only transient relief from suffering.

The phrase "brother-physicians" is one that applies especially in medicine, because for more than two thousand years in all civilized countries educated physicians have recognized each other as belonging to a brotherhood. It comes from the time when the study of medicine was hereditary in certain families and when the candidate swore by Apollo and all the gods "to reckon him who taught me this art equally dear to me as my parents, to share my substance with him and relieve his necessities if required, to look upon his offspring as my own brothers," etc. Thus medical men everywhere recognize the claim of a physician to advice and care in case of sickness or injury and accept no fee for it. As Weir Mitchell says, "the physicians' guild is a world-wide guild, the only one."

It is necessary, in speaking of medicine as a career, to consider its demands as well as its inducements, and these demands, for those who wish to secure such success as I have referred to, are for good mental capacity, for a long period of study, for much patience, for powers of physical endurance, for quick and keen sympathies, for honesty and for purity of thought, word, and deed. In the hands of the physician are placed at times not only the issues of life and death, but of things more valuable than these. Not more than one man in a thousand can properly comply with all these demands. The young man whom I would advise to take medicine as a career should have had a broad preliminary education, he should know his "humanities," and it is highly desirable that he should have taken his B.A. degree at a large university, not merely as a guarantee that he has had proper training, but because of the associations which he will have formed there, the ideas which are in the air, the intelligent sympathy with literature, science, and art which will there be developed and which is essential to his future usefulness and happiness. He is then to take a four years' course of instruction in a medical school having ample facilities in the way of laboratories and hospitals. Following this should come a service of a year and a half as resident in a large hospital.

By the end of this period, and not much before the end of it, he will be qualified to form a fairly wise judgment as to his own

capacity and tastes and as to the particular branch or branches of medicine which are best suited to his wishes. He must beware of beginning to specialize too soon; the foundations must be broad. Now he can decide whether his next two or three years of study shall be spent chiefly in laboratories or in clinics, or how they shall be divided between the two. As an undergraduate in medicine, his work in laboratories must be confined to the learning of a few methods of *technique* and something of the spirit which animates research. When he comes to making original research for himself, he will find that its demands for unremittent persistent attention and thought are such that for the time being he can do little else. The clinic instruction which he needs after his residence in the hospital is not to be had in one place or from one man: he needs to compare the manners, the methods, and the results of different men, each the leader in his own place, and for this purpose he must travel and visit the great clinics in different cities. This done he will be ready to go to work, he will have some idea, though probably not an adequate one, of the things he does not know, and his advice and opinions will begin to be valuable. There is little cause to fear lest he do not find employment; there is always a place for a competent and trustworthy man-for one who can be depended on to work without supervision and to do more than the letter of his engagement calls for; and in laboratories, in hospitals, in medical schools, and in the broad field of practice there are such places waiting to-day for the men who have not yet been found for them.

But it will be said by some, "You demand too much time and money for education and training; the man ought to begin to support himself long before your scheme would permit him to do so." My answer is that the man who has the means which will enable him to spend the time above indicated as required to fit him to take charge of the health and lives of his fellow-men had better so invest them, while he who has not such means should carefully consider as to whether he had better not abandon all thought of studying medicine and try some of the numerous other occupations which offer a better investment for his time and money and in which he may be a less dangerous and more useful member of society. This country is in no need of men possessing the diploma of Doctor of Medicine; it already has at least twenty thousand more of them than it requires or can properly support; but it does need several hundred, say a thousand, more of such properly-trained physicians as I have indicated, and I

am quite sure that the people will be able to recognize them when they appear and will take proper care of their material interests.

My young friend whose attention I wish to direct to medicine as a career will have spent five years at a good intermediate school as a preliminary to entering the university, which he does when he is about seventeen years old. He spends three or four years at the university, four years at the medical school, one and one-half years in the hospital, and two years in travel and special studies. When, therefore, he is ready to begin work he will be about twenty-eight years old, and his education, living, books, etc., will have cost about eight thousand dollars from the time he entered the university. It can be done for less, but this is a fair average estimate.

I am not considering medicine as a trade or looking at it from the commercial point of view. I have not presented among its attractions the probabilities of being able to have a villa at Newport or to keep a yacht or fast horses, but have only claimed that it will provide means to secure a comfortable and happy home and to aid in some degree those who are less fortunate. The physician whom I have in mind cannot afford to waste his time in making more money than is required for his own immediate needs and for those of his family; as one who has had special advantages in culture and in the acquisition of knowledge, he is subject to special claims on the part of his fellow-men who have not been granted such opportunity. The torch of science is placed in his hands, not merely to illuminate his own path, but to enable him to guide and help others in their passage over Mirza's bridge, out of the darkness into the darkness; and, moreover, it is his duty to hand it on to his successors with added fuel, that it may be more bright for them than it has been for himself. His duties as a citizen are higher than those of non-professional men, for increase of knowledge brings with it not only power, but responsibility as well. This, no doubt, brings upon him at times special cares and anxieties: he will see signs of coming trouble in what to most men may appear to add to beauty or to be evidences of robust health and prosperity; he may have to take the unpleasant part of Cassandra in giving unheeded warnings of evils to come. But these are but incidental and occasional troubles, far more than counterbalanced by the satisfaction derived from the interesting, continuous, useful employment and development of every human faculty which even now belongs to, and which in the near future will still more characterize, medicine as a career.

JOHN S. BILLINGS.

EMOTIONAL TENSION AND THE MODERN NOVEL.

It was my privilege to ask a question in the January number of this review and to answer it in my own way to the best of my ability. What is a novel? That was the question. Now the answer was: A novel is a pocket-theatre. In the course of an attempt to demonstrate the truth of this definition the words "romance" and "realism" could hardly fail to escape the modern writer's pen; for there is much talk in our day of the realistic school of fiction, and the romantic school, though not often mentioned, is understood to be opposed to it. Of course, it is easy to enter into a long discussion about the exact meanings of the two words; but, on the whole, it seems to be true that if the people who talk about schools of fiction mean anything or wish to mean anything, which sometimes seems doubtful, they mean this: the realist proposes to show men what they are; the romantist tries to show men what they should be. It is very unlikely that mankind will ever agree as to the relative merits of these two, and the discussion which was practically begun in Plato's time is not likely to end so long as people care what they read or what they think. The most any one can do is to give a personal opinion, and that means, of course, that he who expresses it commits himself and publicly takes either the one side or the other. For my part, I believe that more good can be done by showing men what they may be, ought to be, or can be than by describing their greatest weaknesses with the highest art. We all know how bad we are; but it needs much encouragement to persuade some of us to believe that we can really be any better. To create genuine interest and afford rest and legitimate amusement without losing sight of that part, and to do so in a more or less traditional way, seems to be the profession of the novelist who belongs to the romantic persuasion.

That novel-writing is a business I am credibly informed by my publishers. And since that is the case, it must be taken for granted that it is a business which to some extent must be practised like any other and which will succeed or fail in the hands of any particular man according as he is more or less fitted to carry it on. The qualifi-

cations for any business are three: native talent, education, and industry. Where there is success of the right kind the talent and power of application must be taken for granted. The education is and always must be a question of circumstance. With regard to novel-writing, when I speak of education I am not referring to it in the ordinary sense. Some people take a great deal of interest in concrete things, while others care more for humanity. The education of a novelist is the experience of men and women which he has got at first hand in the course of his own life, for he is of that class to whom humanity offers a higher interest than inanimate nature. He can use nature and art only as a scene and background upon which and before which his personages move and have their being. It is his business to present his readers with something which I have called the pocket-theatre, something which every man may carry in his pocket, believing that he has only to open it in order to look in upon the theatre of the living world. To produce it, to prepare it, to put it into a portable and serviceable shape, the writer must know what that living world is, what the men in it do and what the women think, why women shed tears and children laugh and young men make love and old men repeat themselves. While he is writing his book his human beings must be with him, before him, moving before the eye of his mind and talking into the ear of his heart. He must have lived himself: he must have loved, fought, suffered, and struggled in the human battle. I would almost say that to describe another's death he must himself have died.

All this accounts perhaps for the fact that readers are many and writers few. The reader knows one side of life, his own, better than the writer possibly can, and he reads with the greatest interest those books which treat of lives like his own. But the writer must have seen and known many phases of existence, and this is what the education of the novelist means: to know and understand, so far as he is able, men and women who have been placed in unusual circumstances. And this need not and should not lead him into creating altogether imaginary characters, nor men and women whose circumstances are not only unusual, but altogether impossible. We see grotesque pieces given at the theatre—too grotesque and too often given—which make us laugh, but never make us think. They would not make good novels. The novel must amuse, indeed, but should amuse reasonably, from an intellectual point of view, rather than as a piece of good fun. Its object is to make one see men and women who might really live,

talk, and act as they do in the book, and some of whom one would perhaps like to imitate. Its intention is to amuse and please, and certainly not to teach or preach; but in order to amuse well it must be a finely-balanced creation, neither hysterical with tears nor convulsed with perpetual laughter. The one is as tiring as the other and, in the long run, as unnatural.

It is easy, comparatively speaking, to appeal to the emotions, but it is hard to appeal to the heart. This may sound somewhat contradictory at first, but there is truth in it nevertheless. The outward emotions are in real life much more the expressions of the temperament than of what we call the heart. We all know that there are men and women who laugh and cry more easily than others, and we are rather inclined to believe that these are not they who feel most deeply. A very difficult question here presents itself. Bacon says somewhere that we are apt to extol the powers of the human intellect without invoking its aid as often as we might. This extolling of humanity has been a fashion of late years, and it has not yet disappeared, though its popularity is waning fast. In England Sir Andrew Clarke, M.D., has recently talked learnedly of "the religion of the body" and Lord Coleridge with eloquence of "the religion of the mind." These things are good enough, no doubt, but what of the religion of the heart, which is after all the only religion there is—if the heart is the earthly representative of the soul? There are some people—fewer than is generally supposed—who really do not believe in the existence of the soul. Let me tell them that they are very near to denying the existence of the heart. Perhaps some of them do, and they may live to repent of their unbelief in this world, if not in the next. What is the heart, or, rather, what do we in common conversation and writing understand by that word? It looks a great deal like attempting to define belief, but belief has received an excellent definition, for belief is knowledge and nothing else, so far as the individual who holds it is concerned. What we call the heart in each man and woman seems to mean the whole body of innate and inherited instincts, impulses, and beliefs, taken together, and in that relation to one another in which they stand after they have been acted upon throughout the individual's life by the inward vicissitudes and the outward circumstances to which he has been exposed. When all this is quiescent I think we call it Self. When roused to emotional activity we call it the Heart. But whatever we call it, it is to this Self or Heart that everything which is ethic and therefore permanent must appeal.

The foundation of good fiction and good poetry seems to be ethic rather than æsthetic. Everything in either which appeals to the taste, that is, to the æsthetic side, may ultimately perish as a mere matter of fashion; but that which speaks to man as man, independently of his fashions, his habits, and his tastes, must live and find a hearing with humanity so long as humanity is human. The right understanding of men and women leads to the right relations of men and women, and in this way, if in any, a novel may do good; when written to attain this end it may live; when addressed to the constant element in human nature, it has as good a right and as good a chance of pleasing the men and women of the world in our day as it had to appeal to the intellect of Pericles or to thrill the delicate sensibilities of Aspasia. Their novels were plays in outward effect, as ours should be in inward substance, and we must needs confess that the form in which their intellectual artistic luxuries were presented to them was superior to that of the modern effort included in four hundred pages at one dollar and twenty-five cents. Possibly, even probably, it is unfair to us to compare ourselves with Sophocles, Euripides, and Aristophanes; yet the comparison suggests itself if the definition be true and if our novels really aspire to be plays.

We have indeed something in our favor which the genuine playwright has not. We appeal entirely to the imagination and, unless we introduce algebraic *formulæ* or scientific discussion, we give no standard measure in our books by which to judge the whole. We can call up surroundings which never were and never can be possible in the world, and if we are able to do it well enough we can put impossible characters upon our stage and make them do impossible things, and the whole, acting upon a predisposed imagination, create for the moment something almost like belief in the mind of the reader. We can conceive a tale fantastic beyond the bounds of probability, and if there is a touch of nature in it we may for a while transport our readers into Fairyland. We can clothe all of this in poetic language if our command of the English tongue is equal to the occasion, and we can lend pathos to a monster and heroism to a burlesque man. But the writer of plays for the real theatre cannot do this; if he does he makes that which in theatrical language is called a "burlesque" or a "spectacle"; or, if he be a member of the "decadent school," he may produce what he has decided to call by a new name—a production not always conducive to a high belief in human nature.

The writer of plays, if he write them for actual performance, has living interpreters, and they and he are judged by the standard of real life. He is to a great extent dependent upon his actors for the effect he hopes to produce, and they are dependent not only upon him, upon their individual education, depth of feeling, and power of expression, but also upon the material conditions and surroundings in which they have to do their work. The most dramatic scene of real life, if it actually took place on the stage of a theatre, would seem a very dull and tame affair to any one who chanced to find himself in the body of the house. The fundamental lack of interest, until it has been artificially aroused, is a gulf not to be bridged by such simple means as being really "natural." The art of the actor lies in knowing the precise degree of exaggeration necessary to produce the impression that he is not exaggerating at all, but exaggeration there must be. Without it, neither the words nor the actions can speak or appeal to the intelligence of the spectator.

But we novelists are in an easier position in our relations to our audience. We are granted many privileges and have many advantages which the playwright has not; for we can appeal to the heart almost directly without the conscious intervention of practiced eyes and ears, used to realities and eager to judge by real standards. We speak of Edwin's great height, broad shoulders, noble features, and silken mustache, and are not obliged to look out for an actor who shall fulfil these conditions of manly beauty before we can be heard without being ridiculous. Angelina's heavy hair is a fact on paper; on the stage it is a wig and must be a good one. Her liquid blue eyes are blue because we say they are; but it would annoy a playwright to find that his leading actress had light gray ones, when Edwin must compare them to the depths of the blackest night.

All this is rather frivolous, perhaps; but a little frivolity is to the point here, since there can be no amusement without a dash of it, and we profess to provide diversion to meet the public demand. With most men who have moulded, hacked, and chiselled the world into history, to think has been to act. With us novelists, so far as the world need know us, to think is to dream and perhaps to dream only little dreams of only passing significance. Few novelists are poets; only one or two have been statesmen; none have been conquerors. I suppose we are very insignificant figures compared with the great ones of this earth; but to our comfort we may dream, and if we need consolation we may console ourselves, as Montaigne puts it, with the

art which small souls have to interest great ones, "*L'art qu'ont les petites âmes d'intéresser les grandes.*"

Frivolity is not weakness, though in excess it may be a weakness. "*Carpe diem*" is a good motto for the morning, but in the evening "*Dulce desipere in loco*" is not to be despised as a piece of advice. The frivolities of great men and famous women have filled volumes of memoirs, and are not without interest to the little, as our little interests do not always seem dull to the great. The greater men are the more heart they have, good or bad, and the easier it is to affect them through it, through the multiform feelings which their varied lives have created within them, or through the few strong sentiments by which most of them are ruled, guided, or impelled according as they are conscientious, calculating, or impulsive, and to some extent according to their nationality, a matter which has almost as much to do with the author's dream as with the reader's subjective interpretation of it, and which largely determines the balance between sentiment and sentimentality.

Sentiment heightens the value of works of fiction as sentimentality lowers it. The distinction is not a fine one and has grown common enough in our day to be universally understood. We owe it, I think, to the international balance of sentiment and sentimentality that the novelists of the present day are the French, Anglo-Saxons, and Russians. With all due respect to the great German intelligence, it does not seem capable of producing what we call a novel. The German mind, measured by our standard, is sentimental, not romantic. Perhaps there is as much romance to be found in the history and traditions of Germany up to a date which I should place at about forty years ago as there is anywhere in the civilized world. Yet, for some reason or other, a modern German, as I have said, seems to be more sentimental than romantic in his habits of thought and feeling.

It is not possible in a paper of this length to inquire into the foundations of sentimentality and romance. Practically, however, what we call a romantic life is one full of dramatic incidents which come unsought as the natural consequence and result of a man's or a woman's character. It is therefore necessarily an exceptional life, and as such should have exceptional interest for the majority. When our lives are not filled with emotions they are too often crammed with insignificant details, too insignificant to bear recording in a novel, but yet making up for each of us all the significance life has. The great emotions are not every-day phenomena, and it is the desire to experi-

ence them vicariously which creates the demand for fiction and thereby and at the same time a demand for emotion. This is felt more particularly nowadays than formerly.

The French Revolution seems to have introduced an emotional phase into social history, and to it we must attribute directly or indirectly many of our present tastes and fashions. With it began the novel in France. With it the novel in the English language made a fresh start and assumed a new form. To take a very simple view of the question, I should like to hazard, as a guess, the theory that when the world had lived at a very high pressure during the French Revolution, the wars of Napoleon, and what has been called the "awakening of the peoples," it had acquired permanently "the emotional habit," just as a man who takes opium or morphia cannot do without it. There was a general desire felt to go on experiencing without dangerous consequences those varying conditions of hope, fear, disappointment, and triumph in which the whole world's nervous system had thrilled daily during so many years and at such fearful cost. The children of the women who had gone to the scaffold with Marie Antoinette, the sons of the men who had charged with Murat, who had stood by *La Tour d'Auvergne*, or who had fired their parting shot with Ney, were not satisfied to dwell in returning peace and reviving prosperity with nothing but insipid tales of shepherds and shepherdesses to amuse them. They wanted sterner, rougher stuff. They created a demand and it was forthwith supplied, and their children and children's children have followed their progenitors' footsteps in war and have adopted their tastes in peace.

Modern civilization, too, has done what it could to stir the hearts of men. Evil communications corrupt good manners, and it is not a play upon words to say that the increased facility of actual communications has widened and deepened those channels of communication which are evil and increased at the same time the demand for all sorts of emotion, bad or good. Not that emotion of itself is bad. It is often the contrary. Even the momentary reflection of true love is a good thing in itself. It is good that men and women should realize that a great affection is, or can be, a reality to many as well as a convenient amusement or a heart-rending drama to a few.

Modern civilization has created modern vices, modern crimes, modern virtues, austerities, and generosityes. The crimes of to-day were not dreamed of a hundred years ago, any more than the sublimity of the good deeds done in our time to remedy our time's mistakes.

And between the angel and the beast of this ending century lie great multitudes of ever-shifting, ever-changing lives, neither very bad nor very good, but in all cases very different from what lives used to be in the good old days when time meant time and not money. There, too, in that vast land of mediocrities, emotions play a part of which our grandfathers never heard, and being real, of the living, and of superior interest to those who feel them, reflect themselves in the novel of to-day, changing the course of true love into very tortuous channels and varying the tale that is ever young with features that are often new. Within a short few months I myself have lived in a land where modern means of communication are not, and I have come to live here where applied science is doing her best to eliminate distance as a factor from the equation of exchanges, financial and intellectual. The difference between the manifestations of human feeling in Southern Italy and North America is greater and wider than can be explained in intelligible terms. Yet I am convinced that it is but skin-deep. Sentiment, sentimentality, taste, fashion, daily speech, acquired science, and transmitted tradition cleanse, soil, model, or deface the changing shell of mutable mortality, and nothing which appeals to that shell alone can have permanent life; but the prime impulses of the heart are, broadly speaking, the same in all ages and almost in all races. The brave man's beats as strongly in battle to-day, the coward's stands as suddenly still in the face of danger, boys and girls still play with love, men and women still suffer for love, and the old still warn youth and manhood against love's snares—all that and much more comes from depths not reached by civilizations nor changed by fashions. Those deep waters the real novel must fathom, sounding the tide-stream of passion and bringing up such treasures as lie far below and out of sight—out of reach of the individual in most cases—until the art of the story-teller makes him feel that they are or might be his. Cæsar commanded his legionaries to strike at the face. Humanity, the novelist's master, bids him strike only at the heart.

F. MARION CRAWFORD.

HOW TO PREVENT THE COMING OF CHOLERA.

THIS is the lesson which the modern physiologist has learned from his inoculations and his cultivation of micro-organisms: the seed, or the germ, may be either preserved or destroyed. If preserved, it may retain its latent life for many years. Then perhaps it may spring up, but may lack moisture and wither away, or it may fall among germicides and be choked; or, under favoring degrees of soil and temperature, it may fructify with amazing rapidity, pursuing its devastating course as it is carried onward from one favorable or unprotected circle to others, until its course is checked by natural decay or by the opposition of intelligent men who are striving to destroy all those terribly destructive enemies of the human race called zymotic diseases.

Before 1831 no such frightful disease as cholera had been known in England. It was quite new to our oldest and most experienced practitioners. But it had been expected. It had long been known in India. In 1817 it had been terribly fatal in the northeastern districts, not only among the native population, but with the English troops; and afterward it could be distinctly traced in a northwesterly course—first to Persia, then to Russia, through Poland to Germany, and then at Hamburg. Its arrival in England had been foretold, and (just as expected) it arrived on the northeastern coast of England, at Sunderland, for the first time in 1831. It extended over Great Britain and Ireland in a form quite new to the medical profession of the time. It then crossed the Atlantic, invaded the United States, turned to the southeast, attacked Spain, the north coast of Africa, France, and Italy. Such a course, overcoming all obstacles of winds and seasons and climates, mountains or the ocean, but following the track of travellers, at once pointed to the mode of spreading which has been observed in all subsequent epidemics. The cholera poison travels. In some way it is carried from person to person—sometimes by persons who have not themselves suffered from its effects. There is abundant evidence that in all the visitations of cholera it has been directly imported, has been taken to a place previously healthy by persons who have arrived from infected places, and has spread first to those who have had inter-

course with the new arrivals. How the poison is diffused is another question, and the answer must be that although other modes of spreading are not impossible, though the air-passages may sometimes first receive a dose of the poison, in the great majority of cases it is by drinking-water that the poison—the *bacillus* or *vibrio*—is multiplied and carried. It is the seed. It finds the most fruitful soil among people prepared for its cultivation by anything which is weakening or depressing: poverty, intemperance, want of fresh air, crowding, dirt, bad food, and, above all, impure drinking-water. When dirty, fecalized water is drunk the general health is lowered. When, in addition to filth, some poison, such as typhoid or cholera, is also added, then we have the seed sown in the soil most likely to yield an abundant harvest. Indeed, the more we learn of the origin, cause, or essential nature of cholera, the more we are led to the conviction that it is a poison which is distributed chiefly through the agency of drinking-water.

But filth is not more than a predisposing cause of disease. In all the visitations of cholera to England the poison has been brought in the same way, always from Hamburg, and always first attacking damp, low-level, crowded districts, where (as Sir John Simon put it) a “dense population lives in the atmosphere of its own excrements and refuse.” But mere dampness and the vapor of putrefaction, however powerfully they may aid in the destructive work of the cholera poison, will not generate it afresh. The seed is not re-created. It is preserved and carried. It passes over the strong, healthy people who live in high and dry places, breathe fresh air, and drink pure water. It decimates the feeble, sickly people who are crowded in damp, low-lying districts, who breathe foul air and drink fecalized water. In all the London cholera epidemics the districts most severely attacked were on the south side of the Thames. The people were living under very similar conditions. The only difference was in the source of the drinking-water supplied to them by two competing water-companies.

One company supplied, in the words of Simon, “as good a water as any distributed in London, while the latter was purveying perhaps the filthiest stuff ever drunk by a civilized community.” A supplied twenty-five thousand houses, B supplied forty thousand. In the A district thirty-seven persons died of cholera to ten thousand living. In the B district one hundred and thirty died to every ten thousand, a mortality more than three times as great. On comparing the two epidemics of 1848–49 and 1853–54, it was distinctly proved that improved water-supply led to a fall in the death-rate from one hun-

dred and twenty-five to thirty-seven among the people who drank water of "comparative excellence," and rose from one hundred and eighteen to one hundred and thirty among those who "drank from even a filthier source than before." And as with cholera so with ordinary diarrhœa, "the population drinking foul water suffered fifty-seven per cent more diarrhœal mortality than the population drinking other water." As in the south of London in the two former epidemics, so in the east of London in 1866 another water-company afforded convincing evidence of the fatal effects of drinking a mixture of water and cholera poison. For the germ of cholera is a poison—not a mineral poison like arsenic or a chemical poison like strychnine, but incalculably more dangerous—a living poison which has the power of multiplying itself with amazing rapidity, a *bacillus* which, having found its way into water, either stagnant or running as a stream or river, spreads, under varying degrees of temperature, very much like the countless myriads of minute beings which make the sea phosphorescent with their gleams for many miles.

The rapid increase of animal poison is incalculable. An atom of small-pox matter inoculated as fluid or borne by the wind when dry multiplies itself many thousand fold in the person so poisoned. A minute speck of the mucous discharge from an animal affected by cattle plague, if put into the blood of a healthy ox, increases so fast that in a few hours the whole of the blood of the animal, weighing many pounds, is so poisoned that every drop of the blood contains enough poison to convey the disease to another animal within forty-eight hours.

Mr. Ernest Hart and Mr. Radcliffe proved conclusively that the spread of the cholera in the east of London in 1866 was distinctly due to the distribution of cholera poison by the East London water-works. It was ascertained beyond all doubt that their filtering apparatus had been out of order for a few days, and that during those few days the company had sent out polluted water from the river Lea either unfiltered or filtered very imperfectly. And it was discovered also that just at that time the Lea had been infected by the discharges from some cholera patients who lived in a cottage which was drained into the river. These patients had arrived at Southampton suffering from cholera in its early or latent stage, or were supposed to have recovered and allowed to pass on to the cottage. They infected the river first and the district supplied by the water-company afterward. This accident or ignorance or carelessness clearly led to sixteen thousand

attacks of cholera and the death of six thousand victims who were supplied with the poisoned water.

We have no test on which we can rely to decide if water which has been filtered contains organisms hurtful to human beings. There are chemical tests which will decide whether organic matter is present in water or not, or present in large or small proportions; but they cannot determine whether the organisms are injurious to health. Even the microscopical evidence of the existence of various species of *bacteria* can only determine if they are all varieties supposed to be innocuous or if any distinct species known to be dangerous are present. The absence or presence of microphytes or their spores in water and the properties of these organisms, how they differ from one another and how far they constitute sources of danger to mankind, should be made at once the subject of investigation. Such an inquiry could be carried out only by governments, and it is one which the United States of America might undertake with the cordial support of the scientific world. In the mean time we may all endeavor to prevent the supply of water from any polluted source. Once polluted, it is very doubtful if any process of filtration or precipitation will completely purify it. And even if sent out fairly pure from the reservoirs of water-companies, it may be contaminated by suction into broken or leaking pipes.

The house-cistern may be another source of danger to which every household is exposed so long as the supply is only daily, not constant. If the water-companies obtained their supply from sources not liable to pollution, neither filtration nor boiling would be necessary. But then there should be a constant service and no house-cistern in which the water might become impure after it had been delivered. With only a daily service into a house-cistern, stirring up any deposit every time the water comes into the cistern, every house should have its own filter. But if the filter is not pure it is worse than useless. Water that passes through a dirty filter is worse than unfiltered water. Therefore the porous part of every filter should be movable and be boiled four minutes once a week. Boiling all water after filtration for five minutes is an additional and often a necessary precaution, and in all epidemics of such spreading diseases as are carried by water, like typhoid fever or cholera, it is advisable to boil all drinking-water for fully five minutes, and all milk which may have been diluted or adulterated by the addition of water. A constant supply of pure water being the most certain means of checking the spread of such infective

diseases, the first demand should be in all towns for purer water than can be had from any river, however well the water may be filtered. Next we must have a constant supply of it and abolish all house-cisterns.

We must next ask, What do we know about the seed, or germ, or microbe, or *bacillus*, or *vibrio* which is the cholera or is the cause of the symptoms which are known as the disease named "Asiatic cholera"? Much that we know has been learned since the last epidemic of cholera in Europe. After the former visitations in 1831, 1848-49, 1853-54, all that could be said was that cholera was a "filth disease," that its essential cause must be something of the nature of a ferment which grows and is carried best in dirty water and is most dangerous among a feeble, dirty, ill-fed population. Now our pathological knowledge is much more precise. When Koch first published his discovery of the "*comma bacillus*" and made known his method of cultivating it on gelatine plates, many doubted how far the origin and propagation of cholera could be explained by the action of this organism. But more recent investigations have removed most of such skepticism, and we now know something of the natural history of the cholera microbe—that it flourishes in the presence of oxygen and may be propagated both in water and in earth. In the absence of oxygen it does not germinate and either withers away or forms active poisonous materials. Other somewhat similar *vibrios* appear to affect the respiratory more than the intestinal passages; so that, although infection by the air must be considered as possible, it is equally certain that drinking-water is by very far the most common mode of conveyance. The poison does not travel as a seed carried by the wind, but it travels along the lines of human intercourse, slowly by pilgrims and caravans, rapidly by railways and steam-vessels. When in 1883 the cholera *bacillus* was first described it was regarded as a straight slender rod. Afterward Koch showed that it was curved like a printed comma, and it is now generally recognized and designated "*vibrio cholera Asiatica*."

It is very doubtful how the cholera was brought to Hamburg last summer. Many believe that as it followed the course of the railways from India through Russia in Asia to European Russia, it was taken by Russian emigrants on their way to America to Hamburg, the port of departure. There is much to be said in favor of this opinion and much on the other side.

"Abolish zymotic diseases." This is the task we should set before the nations of the world as the lesson taught by the epidemic of cholera

in 1892. Our governments, our municipalities, the clergy of all denominations, our own households, should learn that no case of cholera, yellow fever, typhoid fever, scarlatina, diphtheria, small-pox, measles, or whooping-cough can be looked upon as natural, providential, or unavoidable; but that the existence of such a group of preventable diseases is a proof of ignorance or negligence, and therefore a disgrace to the country, to the town, to the family. And when men learn how much easier it is to prevent than to cure—that none of these diseases are spontaneously generated—we shall have gone a long way toward their total abolition, and they may ultimately be banished.

So long as the drinking-water of the people in town or country is supplied or obtained from sources liable to pollution, so long will the danger to public health be present and occasional epidemics certainly arise. The modern custom of the disposal of the dead bodies of those killed by zymotic diseases by burial in the earth is a source of great danger to the living. More must be said as to the danger of poisoning the sources of water-supply by ordinary sewage and drainage and by the discharge of the cholera *vibrios* into streams and rivers. But here it is necessary to make better known the fact that the germs of infective disease may be long preserved in the earth. For this knowledge we are indebted to Pasteur, after the examination of the soil of fields where cattle had been buried whose death had been caused by that fatal disease known as "*charbon*" or splenic fever. The observations of Darwin "on the formation of mould," made when he was a young man, are curiously confirmatory of the more recent conclusions of Pasteur. In Darwin's paper, read at the Geological Society of London, in 1837, he proved that in old pasture-land every particle of the superficial layer of earth overlying different kinds of subsoil had passed through the intestines of earth-worms. The worms swallow earthy matter, and after separating the digestible or serviceable portion, they eject the remainder in little coils or heaps at the mouth of their burrows. In dry weather the worm descends to a considerable depth and brings up to the surface the particles which it ejects. This agency of earth-worms is not so trivial as it might appear. By observation in different fields, Darwin proved in one case that a depth of more than three inches of this worm-mould had been accumulated in fifteen years, and in another that the earth-worms had covered a bed of marl with their mould in eighty years to an average depth of thirteen inches.

Pasteur's later researches on the etiology of *charbon* show that

this earth-mould positively contains the specific germs which propagate the disease, and that the same specific germs are found within the intestines of the worms. The parasitic organism, or *bacteridium*, which, inoculated from a diseased to a healthy animal, propagates the specific disease, may be destroyed by putrefaction after burial. But before this process has been completed, germs or spores may have been formed which will resist the putrefactive process for many years and lie in a condition of latent life, like a grain of corn or any flower-seed, ready to germinate and communicate the specific disease. In a field in the Jura, where a diseased cow had been buried two years before, at a depth of nearly seven feet, the surface earth not having been disturbed in the interval, Pasteur found that the mould contained germs which, introduced by inoculation into a guinea-pig, produced *charbon* and death. And, further, if a worm were taken from an infected spot, the earth in the alimentary canal of the worm contained these spores or germs of *charbon* which, inoculated, propagate the disease. And the mould deposited on the surface by the worms, when dried into dust, was blown over the grass and plants on which the cattle feed, and might thus spread the disease. After various farming operations of tilling and harvest, Pasteur found the germs just over the graves of the diseased cattle, but not to any great distance. After rains or morning dews, the germs of *charbon*, with a quantity of other germs, were found about the neighboring plants, and Pasteur suggests that in cemeteries it is very possible that germs capable of propagating specific diseases of different kinds, quite harmless to the earth-worm, may be carried to the surface of the soil ready to cause disease in the proper animals. The practical inferences in favor of cremation are so strong that, in Pasteur's words, they "need not be enforced."

The relation between burial of the dead in the earth, the pollution of the supply of drinking-water, and the spread of cholera, typhoid fever, and such infective diseases, is lately being recognized, and the lesson cannot be too strongly forced upon public attention. A body full of cholera or typhoid *bacilli* is buried in the earth with or without a coffin. The coffin may retard the process of escape into the earth for a time, possibly until the *bacilli* have perished as putrefaction goes on. But sooner or later, under favorable or unfavorable conditions of temperature and moisture and soil, the *bacilli* infect the surrounding earth and the water which runs from it into adjacent rivulets. This has been amply proved in the case of the *bacilli* of typhoid fever. The terrible epidemic which devastated the town of Plymouth, in Pennsyl-

vania, seven years ago, was clearly proved to have originated in the discharges from one patient having gained access to the drinking-water supplied to the town. In Philadelphia about a thousand persons die every year from typhoid, and it has been distinctly proved that the water supplied to the city is contaminated by leaking and drainage from seven large cemeteries which poison the rivers and reservoirs. In the words of a distinguished physician, "these little drops of water, squeezed by Father Time from the dead, are loaded with sure death for the living who drink of it." Some persons doubt whether poison can be carried through the earth for any considerable distance; but the fact has been experimentally proved as to saline solutions.

It is no doubt true that the seeds or germs of epidemic diseases may be destroyed, wholly or partially, after burial by the process of putrefaction. Probably they are often totally destroyed. But occasionally they are preserved with all their destructive powers for many years. In one very remarkable case the seeds of scarlatina germinated after being buried for thirty years. In a Yorkshire village part of a closed graveyard was taken into the adjoining rectory garden. The earth was dug up, and scarlatina soon broke out in the rectory nursery and from thence spread over the village. It proved to be of the same virulent character as the scarlatina which thirty years before had destroyed the villagers buried in the precise part of the churchyard which had been taken into the garden and dug up. No other explanation of the outbreak could be offered. And what is true of *charbon* and of scarlet fever seems to be true of yellow fever. Indeed, the investigation as to yellow fever has been carried out much more fully.

It is vain to hope for the abolition of cholera if its *bacilli* are still to be preserved by burying in the earth the bodies of the victims. The dead bodies of cholera patients are not merely dead organic matter. All dead bodies, whatever may have been the cause of death, contain myriads of living organisms. As soon as life ceases, these organisms assist in the process of decomposition, form poisonous products, and may excite disease if brought by air or water into contact with living beings. But what is much more important is the fact that, in a proportion of little less than twenty per cent, the bodies buried in the usual way in the earth contain, in addition to the ordinary agents of decomposition and putrefaction, the germs of zymotic diseases: the seeds of scarlet fever, yellow fever, small-pox, typhoid, cholera—the germs of pestilence almost imperishable in the earth, ready after many

years of latency to revivify and recommence their infective activity. Any mode of burying the dead in the earth, with or without a coffin, exposes the living to unnecessary danger. Anything short of complete destruction by fire or by some powerful chemical agent must be powerless or incomplete as a safeguard. We segregate our living small-pox patients and make it a misdemeanor to expose them publicly. We treat cholera patients in a similar way and adopt quarantine restrictions to protect the healthy from infection; but when they are dead we dispose of their bodies in the very way most likely to preserve and multiply the disease germs which they contain and so assist in their future mischief-working.

The work of Pasteur, done mostly within the last thirty years, in determining the bacterial origin of many diseases, in attenuating the virus, and in proving the mitigating and protective effect of inoculating with it so attenuated, has led us a certain way in the direction of protection. But protection is not prevention, and it is prevention that must be the object of future efforts. Who shall say that it is impossible? Bacterial organisms, like all others, must have living, feeding, and breeding places. Take away their means of existence and they will die out, as have done the mammoth and the dodo. If vaccination were universal and there were no more unprotected subjects in which to settle, what would become of small-pox microbes, starved and turned out of house and home? What would become of cholera *vibrios* if they could be kept out of water?

Just now a disease as fatal as many of the most prevalent of zymotic diseases put together is either to be added to the number, or classed with them as the result of the action of a living organism, and therefore to be guarded against by attenuated inoculation or treated by germicidal remedies. We have not yet advanced far in this direction; but although Koch's work is still incomplete, there is good reason to believe that before many years have passed we shall be able to speak of pulmonary consumption as one of our vanquished enemies, and glory in another triumph of experimental physiology and of comparative pathology over a disease which is still fearfully destructive of human life and the cause of untold suffering and misery. In the Botanic Garden of Lyons flower-pots were filled with earth on the 16th of June, 1891, and some earth-worms were added in each pot, with some of the *sputa* of tuberculous patients and fragments of lung from their dead bodies. A month afterward, it was found that the earth-worms contained tubercle *bacilli* in large numbers, and that

guinea-pigs inoculated with them soon died with general tuberculosis. Whatever the *bacilli* may be, whether tubercular, typhoid, or choleraic, in bodies buried in the earth, it is incontestable that earth-worms, everywhere so numerous and active, may preserve the *bacilli* in their bodies during many months, still living and losing none of their virulent properties and power of rapid germination or reproduction. These are the grounds on which I assert that bodies after death from cholera, from consumption, and from any infective disease ought to be cremated, not buried. Perhaps the time is not very far distant when the revival of the ancient custom will not be limited to deaths from specific diseases, but will become universal.

If we are ever to abolish cholera we must do all that is possible, collectively and individually, to raise the standard of national health. Next, we have to protect the people from the seeds of infective diseases. We must intercept the transit of diseased travellers, not by unnecessary and vexatious quarantine restrictions, nor interference with commercial and social intercourse between healthy places; but we must insist on careful inspection of all arrivals from infected ports. The work of the family or the individual must be left to the family doctor. But the lessons which the cholera of 1892 should teach every one are that a supply of pure drinking-water must be obtained; that when this is impossible impure water must be boiled, and when any one dies the body must be cremated, not buried in the earth.

SPENCER WELLS.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF BOSTON.

WHILE on my tour of investigation I discovered that the schools of no other city were in better repute than those of Boston, and scarcely a day passed that I was not asked to express an opinion concerning them. In consideration of the good opinion so generally held of the Boston schools, I sincerely wish that I could close my comments upon them with the opening sentence, that is, without examining into the facts of the case in order to learn whether Boston had the game as well as the name. But for two reasons I cannot pass these schools by unnoticed: first, because the Boston child is entitled to as much consideration as the child of any other city, and, secondly, because a series of articles on American schools that contained no account of the schools of Boston would be as incomplete as a history of the United States without an account of George Washington. Being, therefore, in a measure forced by circumstances to write about the schools of Boston, I am in duty bound to speak as freely of them as of the schools of any other city.

If there be a city where we have every right to expect to find a uniformly high degree of excellence in the schools, and where poor schools are less pardonable than in other cities, that city is Boston. For the conditions under which its schools labor are, and have been for a comparatively long period, in a measure ideal. First, the school-system is not a machine, both principals and teachers being allowed enough liberty to develop their powers. Secondly, the appointment of teachers and principals is controlled, largely at least, by merit and not by "pulls." In the selection of principals special care is exercised. As to the teachers, although the graduates of the Boston Normal School appear, other things being equal, to have the preference, others are preferred if they are found better qualified than the home candidates. To a certain extent, the principals are permitted to select their own teachers, and teachers are not usually forced upon principals as in many other cities. Thirdly, no teacher receives a permanent appointment until she has taught in the public schools of Boston for

four years. Until that period has elapsed she is reappointed annually. Further, if, after receiving a permanent appointment, she proves herself positively incompetent, no amount of "pull" can keep her in her place. Fourthly, Boston, with its twelve hundred teachers, has now and has had for some fifteen years a city-superintendent and six assistant-superintendents. Lastly, the cost of instruction *per capita* is exceptionally high.

In view of their superior advantages, the Boston schools, generally speaking, fall far short of what they ought to be. Their particular weakness lies in the primary grades, the grammar schools being upon a much higher level. Indeed, taken all in all, so marked is the difference between the primary and the grammar schools that they scarcely appear to belong to the same system and to be in charge of the same superintendents and principals. But even the grammar schools are very uneven, the unevenness being marked, not only between the teaching found in different schools, but also between that found in the different class-rooms of the same school, excellent and very inferior teaching frequently going on side by side.

The Boston primary schools belong, in my opinion, to the purely mechanical drudgery-schools. The children are not obliged to sit motionless in a uniform position, it is true, but the teaching is highly unscientific, and the teachers, though not really severe in the treatment of the pupils, are nevertheless cold and unsympathetic. In the first school year there is very little objective work, what there is of it being limited to drawing, paper-cutting, and modelling. In the lower grades the sciences are not taught at all and in the higher ones but little is done in the way of science-teaching. The unification of studies is not attempted in the primary grades.

I shall first describe the work I witnessed during the course of an hour spent in the lowest grade of what I consider one of the best of the seven primary schools that I visited. I entered the room just as school was opening for the day. The morning session began with a song, and the song was followed by a short phonic drill in which all the children in the class took part. A short lesson in mechanical reading given to the whole class followed. That this reading was purely mechanical is proved by the fact that during the exercise the sentences read were of the following order: "I can eat," "I will wait," "*Can you eat?*" etc. When these two general lessons were over—they lasted only a few minutes—the teacher divided the class into two sections. To one of these sections she assigned some busy-

work,¹ and to the other she gave a lesson in number. The busy-work consisted of copying the following example, which the teacher wrote upon the blackboard: $00 + 00 = 0000$. The little ones were obliged to write this upon their slates over and over again for fifteen minutes, that is, during the whole period devoted to the number-lesson given to the other section.

The number-lesson that was given meanwhile was also perfectly mechanical, although objects were used during a part of the time. Indeed, educators agree that objective work can be made fully as mechanical as purely abstract work when the teacher is wanting in pedagogical spirit. During the first part of the lesson sticks were used, all the calculations being made with visible sticks. In the latter part of the lesson the calculations were all made with invisible cats. During that part of the lesson devoted to sticks the teacher held up one or more sticks as occasion required, and asked such questions as the following: "How many sticks are two and one stick?" "If you have two sticks and I give you two sticks more how many sticks will you have?" "If you have four sticks and I take two sticks away how many sticks will you have left?" When some ten minutes had been devoted to "stick arithmetic" the teacher said, "Now see what we are going to talk about to-day." She then wrote on the blackboard the word "Cats," drew a line under the word, and wrote under this line examples such as the following:

$$1 + 1 =, 2 + 2 =, 3 + 2 =, 3 - 1 =, 4 - 2 =, 5 - 1 =, \text{etc.}$$

The answers were asked for after each example had been written and they were given in this way: "One cat and one cat are two cats," "Four cats less two cats are two cats," etc. The teacher evidently thought that the number-work was made concrete when the children said the word "cats" after the numbers. Nothing but sticks and cats were spoken of during the whole lesson. When this lesson was over, the whole class spent a few minutes in marching. After the marching, the teacher assigned busy-work to those pupils who had just finished their number-lesson, and gave a lesson in reading to the others. For busy-work the children copied on their slates the word "cats" as well

¹ By busy-work is meant the work performed by one section of the class while the teacher is imparting instruction to another. In the schools of most of our cities, the busy-work is of such a nature as to tax the child severely without being of much benefit to him beyond keeping him occupied. In exceptional instances, as at Indianapolis, whose schools were described in the December number of the FORUM, the busy-work is both interesting and profitable.

as the examples that had been written upon the board. For reading-matter the teacher wrote upon the board all sorts of silly sentences, such as "I see a fat cat," "I see a fat rat."

The above is a description of everything that was done in this class-room during the first school hour in the morning. Was there anything in this teaching that was not purely mechanical or that did not partake of the nature of pure drudgery-work? Owing to the fact that the children are thoroughly drilled in phonics, they become independent readers very early; but reading-lessons such as those just described are certainly not calculated to make thoughtful readers.

After leaving this room I heard some reading in the highest (third-year) class. I found it expressionless, thoughtless, and mechanical and, altogether, what I should call poor third-year reading. At half-past ten I entered a second-year class-room and looked over some of the slates in order to see what the children had done in the early part of the morning. I discovered that the busy-work of this class was fully as mechanical as that of the first one visited. During a portion of the first hour and a half of the morning session the pupils of one section of the class had written on one side of their slates the sentence, "See the sun rise," and on the other side had copied a number of examples from the blackboard. One of the pupils had written the sentence nineteen times and had written and calculated sixty such examples as the following: $12 + 3 =$, $13 + 2 =$, $14 - 2 =$, $13 - 1 =$, etc.

In another first-year class of this school the children had written for busy-work a slateful of the word "little." One boy had written it forty-one times and another thirty-seven times. These two, who were sitting next to each other, told me that they had been racing. The slates themselves gave evidence enough that distinctness had been sacrificed to speed, for the word "little" had lost all resemblance to itself when it had been written for the twentieth time. I was present also when the teacher of this class assigned some busy-work to one of the sections. This was similar to that given in the first room visited and consisted of the following example, which the children were obliged to copy for fifteen minutes upon their slates: $11 + 111 = 1111$.

During a previous visit to this school I was struck also by the mechanical nature of the work. At that time I heard much concert-work and a ludicrously mechanical concert-drill in phonics. One of the sounds taught was the sound of *sh*. The words "she," "ship," and others were used in teaching this sound. Each one of these words was sounded in concert twice in succession, thus: "Sh-e, she; sh-e,

she; s, h says sh; s, h says sh; sh-i-p, ship; sh-i-p, ship; s, h says sh; s, h says sh." I found that saying things twice over whenever occasion for a drill arose was a custom closely adhered to in Boston schools, whether or not occasion called for a repetition. When sh had been studied for some time, one of the pupils went to the blackboard and sounded at least twenty words that had been written upon it. The process was exceedingly tedious not only to the child at the board, but also to the others that sat idly by. Nevertheless, a second child was called upon to go over the same ground. None of the other pupils paid any attention whatever to what was going on at the blackboard. In another room the children studied in concert the long sounds of the vowels. Such words as "name," "here," "fine," "bone," and "tune" had been written upon the blackboard. The drill was carried on thus: Beginning with the word "name," the pupils (this time pronouncing the letters instead of the sounds) recited together in a perfectly rhythmical sing-song: "N-a-m-e, name; n-a-m-e, name; e at the end of the word makes the a say its own name, e at the end of the word makes the a say its own name; h-e-r-e, here; h-e-r-e, here; e at the end of the word makes the e say its own name, e at the end of the word makes the e say its own name."

I repeat that the work of this primary school was as good as that of any that I visited. It was only here and there that I found in Boston a primary-school teacher who did not teach mechanically and who was endowed with the spirit so frequently found among the teachers of the progressive primary schools.

In one of the poorer districts of Boston I found a primary school of a very inferior order both as regards methods and tone. I visited one of the highest class-rooms of this school just after the children had a written examination in arithmetic. I saw the examination papers lying on the desk and I asked the teacher's permission to glance over some of them. She answered my request by clutching the papers for dear life. Then she looked at the first one and said: "This is the poorest scholar in the class." I was not permitted to examine it. After looking over a second one she remarked, "This is also the poorest scholar in the class." She then looked at some twenty more and put them all aside with the remark that they all seemed to be the poorest scholars in the class. At last she found a passable paper and handed it to me for inspection. The teacher here broke off the embarrassing situation by saying to me, "I think we will have some physiology." Then addressing the class she said: "Begin your

physiology and go right straight through with it." The children began to recite their physiology in concert and continued to do so without a single break for at least ten minutes. As the recitation was accompanied by many peculiar gestures, it may perhaps be more appropriately designated as a "physiological performance." It ran as follows:¹

"My body is built of bones, covered with flesh and skin; the blood flows through it all the time, from my heart. (The pupils here swept their hands up and down their bodies to imitate the circulation of the blood, and ended this part of the performance by pointing to the heart.) The parts of my body are the head, the trunk, the limbs. (The children touched with the forefingers of both hands most of the parts as they named them.) This is my head; I am now touching the crown of my head, the back of my head, the sides of my head, my face, my forehead, my two temples, my two eyes, my nose, my two cheeks, my mouth, my chin, my two ears, my neck, my two shoulders, my two arms, my two hands, my trunk, my back, my two sides, my chest, my two legs, my two knees, my two feet (they sat back in their seats), and I am now sitting erect. I must be sure to keep my mouth closed when I am not talking or singing, especially when I am walking, running, or asleep. My two nostrils are outside doors, always open to admit air, and inside of the upper part of the nose there are two other openings through which it passes into the throat. I must not use my mouth as a box or pin-cushion; the pin or whatever I have put into it may slip into my throat and cause my death. . . . My hand is used in holding, throwing, catching, and feeling. I am now touching the palm of my hand, the back of my hand, my fingers, my thumb, my forefinger, . . . my knuckles, my nails, the ball of my thumb, and the lines where the flesh is bent. My leg has two parts: my thigh and my lower leg, and three joints: my hip-joint, my knee-joint, and my ankle-joint. My foot is used in standing, walking, running, skating, and jumping. On my foot are my instep, my toes, the sole of my foot, the ball, the hollow, the heel, the toe-joints, and my toe-nails, which protect my toes. My bones are hard, they make my body strong; there are about two hundred bones in my body. The bones of my head are my skull and my lower jaw; my face has fourteen bones, my ear has four small bones, at the root of my tongue is one bone. . . . My upper arm has one bone, my forearm has two bones, my wrist has eight bones; from my wrist to my knuckles are five bones, my thumb has two bones, each finger has three bones, making nineteen bones in my hand. My thigh has one bone, my lower leg has two bones, my knee-pan is the cap which covers and protects my knee; in my foot near my heel are seven bones, in the middle of my foot are five bones, my great toe has two bones, each of my four toes has three bones, making twenty-six bones in my foot."

How long this process might have been continued I do not know; but after it had been kept up for some ten minutes the teacher suggested a song. What wisecracks these big words must have made of

¹ The text-book in physiology used by the teacher was entitled "Object Lessons on the Human Body," by Sarah F. Buckelew and Margaret W. Lewis.

the children! But these words were comparatively simple for third-year pupils compared with those that were printed upon the tickets given to the good pupils of a Boston A, B, C class, namely:

"Reward of Merit. Presented to Master ——— as an honorable testimonial of approbation for industry, punctuality, and good conduct."

In other class-rooms of this school I found things on much the same level. The busy-work throughout was limited to copying words and figures from the blackboard. In the lowest grade the children had written over and over again upon their slates, "5 hats + 2 hats = 7 hats." In another third-year room the pupils had been copying sentences from a slip of paper upon their slates, each sentence having been copied twice. The following sentences were written upon one of these slips of paper: "Put the tumbler on the table." "Fanny, tie the horse tight." "Tom has broken his skates." "It is my turn to jump." "May took the best slate." "The tree grew very tall." "How much did the sled cost?" "Put the pony in the barn."

Taken all in all, this is one of the poorest schools that I have ever visited. The fact that the school is situated in a poor district and attended by a poor class of children makes matters worse. The poorest class of children are most in need of good teaching and sympathetic surroundings. A single school of this nature in a city that has the advantages of Boston is one too many, but among the seven primaries that I visited I found three much upon the order of this school, the other two also being situated in poor districts.

An entirely different story may be told of the Boston grammar schools. Although much mechanical teaching may be found even here, the proportion of good work is comparatively large and the tone is much better than it is in the primary schools. Some of the Boston grammar schools are certainly among the best in the country. That the difference between the primary and grammar schools is so marked, in spite of the fact that they are in charge of the same principals, is, in my opinion, largely because the principals are selected rather for their general culture than for their professional qualifications. This circumstance exerts a more unfavorable influence upon the primary than upon the grammar grades, for the reason that those better acquainted with the subject-matter to be taught than with the manner in which the mind acquires ideas are likely to have less sympathy with children before than after the mechanical difficulties in reading have been overcome and the ability to cipher moderately well

has been acquired. Persons who do not understand the nature of the child-mind too frequently believe that it matters little how a knowledge of the rudiments is acquired, so that, in their hands, the primary schools are liable to become drill-schools, wherein the work is considered satisfactory when certain mechanical results are obtained in a given period of time regardless of all other considerations. Educated teachers who do not possess the proper professional qualifications consequently concentrate their thoughts principally upon the work of the grammar grades, where the subject-matter itself is much more interesting than in the primary grades. That so many Boston teachers, though scholarly, are weak in professional knowledge, accounts also for the fact that so much mechanical teaching is found in the grammar schools. Although many of the Boston teachers endeavor to improve their minds after receiving their appointments, the time spent in study is usually devoted to other subjects than pedagogics.

There is another factor, though of secondary importance, to account for the difference between the grammar and the primary schools. Separate buildings are provided for these schools, from one to three primary schools being in charge of each grammar principal. When we consider that the principals are obliged, not only to supervise the grammar schools, but also to teach in them ten hours a week, we find that the grammar schools necessarily receive the lion's share of their attention and that the primaries are more or less neglected. At a principals' meeting I heard one of the assistant-superintendents remark that the principals did not look after the primary as well as after the grammar schools. The consensus of opinion among the principals present was that they should be relieved of the duty of teaching, in order that more time might be at their disposal to supervise the primary schools.

For general excellence, tone, and spirit no school of the country impressed me more favorably than the Everett School. In language-work particularly the results were far beyond those generally found in grammar schools. Indeed, to compare the language, both written and spoken, used by the children of this school with that used in the average school throughout the country is, in my opinion, one of the best means of showing how much time and energy are wasted in the average school. In the Everett School language is not developed at the expense of other studies. In an eighth-year class a number of compositions were read in my presence, and they were, both in thought and in language, far above the average grammar-school work. In the

highest (ninth-year) class the principal, Mr. Walter S. Parker, suggested that I make a test of whatever nature I desired. I proposed a fifteen-minutes' composition on any topic in the history of the United States that the pupils might select. When I had mentioned the subject the principal informed me that the pupils had not studied history during the previous eight months. He thought, however, that the test might be valuable in showing how well the scholars remembered what they had learned of history during previous years. The pupils protested, but the principal insisted, and the results were exceptionally good. The subjects chosen were various, and not one of the pupils selected a battle or a war. The accounts of what they undertook were clear and full, and the language was beautiful. The following are a few of these compositions printed just as they were handed to me after the first writing. They represent the average class-work:

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Thomas Jefferson, our third president, was born in Virginia. His father was a planter and owned much property. He sent his son to college from where he was graduated with high honors. He became a fine linguist, excellent penman, fluent orator, gallant horseman, expert violinist, and knew besides Greek, Latin, French, Spanish, and Italian languages. To him do we owe the change of the pound, shilling, and pence, to our dimes, dollars, and cents. He was Secretary of State under Washington, Vice President under John Adams, and afterwards became President of the United States, serving two terms. He was often called the "Sage of Monticello," that being his home after presidential life. He died in the year 1826.

COLUMBUS.

In the year 1406, the city of Genoa in Italy, had the honor of giving birth to one of the noblest and most persevering men the world has ever seen. This man was Columbus. He was one of the many children of poor parents, who although poor, were industrious. Columbus' father was a wool-weaver, and it was only with the greatest of difficulty and sacrifice, that he was able to send his son to school. Columbus repaid him however, for he became a skillful student in astronomy and other sciences. Soon after leaving college he pined after a seafaring life. He accordingly became a sailor on his uncle's vessel, and here it was that his first ideas of another world began. In his many voyages around the world, he had noticed several things which led him to suppose that another world than the one then known, existed. But when he made known his thoughts, they were met with scorn and ridicule. Even learned men laughed at the very idea, and kings and queens agreed with them. It was not until the good Queen Isabella, of Spain, had determined to listen to the "foolish man," as he was called, against the wishes of the people, that the first ray of hope dawned upon Columbus' life. With a view of converting many poor savages, she succeeded in securing for him the necessary outfit of vessels and men, with which to take the new world by storm.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

A few days ago, on February 22, we celebrated the anniversary of the birth of the "Father of our Country." Although nearly a century has passed since his death, his memory is as dear to us Americans as he himself was to our forefathers. His life and his deeds are related to the rising generations who in turn narrate them to their children; and in this way, as well as by history, we have learned to love and revere the famous name of Washington. He was born in Va., the "birthplace of presidents," and, his father dying when he was a child, Washington received his early training from his mother. He had a comfortable home, but his mother saw fit to teach him while young to be self-reliant and self-denying; so, at the age of 16, after having received his education at the common schools of Va., he went into the wildest parts of his native State, among the forests, to survey land for his relative, Lord Fairfax. He lived in a hut, slept on a bed of dry leaves, sometimes his only food was acorn and nuts, and his only companions were the Indians and the wild beasts of the forests.

Mr. Parker attributes these results in language largely to the fact that the teachers in all the grades endeavor to lead the children to use choice language both in speaking and in writing. He said, furthermore, that the pupils were obliged to use their own words during the recitations instead of the words of the text-book, and that much could be done in the way of breaking pupils of the habit of using the words of the text-book by giving them very long lessons to learn in certain branches, so that they might not have enough time to learn them by heart and yet have ample time to read them over with sufficient care to get the sense. In this manner the pupils became enabled to give, in their own words, long accounts, both oral and written, of what they had read.

Another excellent school that I visited was the George Putnam School, at Roxbury, where much attention is given to natural-science-work. Mr. Henry L. Clapp, the principal, is much interested in this line of study, and he and his first assistant have made splendid collections of shells, minerals, and insects. Much is done in the way of drawing from natural objects, and these drawings are as fine as any of the kind that I have ever found in elementary schools. To those who are interested in teaching the natural sciences in the elementary schools, the George Putnam School is well worth a visit. Its admirable features are not limited to the science-work. Much is done to develop spontaneity and to make the pupils love their school. In the highest grade, a club has been formed by the members of the class, and from time to time meetings are held in the school-room during the last fifteen minutes of the afternoon session. These meetings, one of which I attended, afford a good deal of amusement to the boys. The principal

informed me that his object in organizing the club was to get the pupils accustomed to parliamentary rulings. Another interesting feature of the school, and one that acts as a stimulant to keep alive what the pupils have learned, is what Mr. Clapp calls "random recitations." The last twenty minutes of some of the recitation hours are devoted to these "random recitations," which are conducted by the scholars. Four subjects are usually taken up, five minutes being devoted to each, the pupils being allowed to ask each other any questions that they are supposed to be able to answer. After one of the pupils has asked two or three questions he appoints another to take his place. During the "random recitations" the class is full of life and enthusiasm. I found the children very quick and generally well informed. While these recitations are going on the teacher sits by and takes no part other than keeping the children from going astray.

In contrast to the grammar-school work just described I witnessed in one of Boston's celebrated grammar schools, among others, three lessons in geography so perfectly mechanical that they were altogether out of harmony with the reputation of the school. In one of the classes the teacher began the lesson with the question:

"With how many senses do we study geography?"

"With three senses: sight, hearing, and touch," answered the pupils.

The children were now told to turn to the map of North America in their geographies and to begin with the capes on the eastern coast. When the map had been found each pupil placed his forefinger upon "Cape Farewell," and when the teacher said "Start," the pupils said in concert, "Cape Farewell," and then ran their fingers down the map, calling out the name of each cape as it was touched. When the fingers were used in this manner the teacher imagined that the pupils were utilizing the sense of touch in studying geography. After the pupils had named all the capes on the eastern coast of North America, beginning at the north and ending at the south, they were told to close their books. When their books had been closed they ran their fingers down the cover and named from memory the capes in their order from north to south.

"How many senses are you using now?" the teacher asked.

"Two senses: touch and hearing," answered the children.

When the capes had thus been repeated a number of times the bays were taken up in the same way. The size of the country was also spoken of and impressed upon the memory by repetition. The

lesson throughout consisted of nothing beyond thus studying in concert a number of cut-and-dried facts; it could hardly have been more mechanical.

The second lesson also was limited to a mechanical drill in facts, and though differing in character from the first, was fully as absurd. During the lesson the teacher was standing at the blackboard mentioning facts or asking questions relating to geographical facts, and when the facts had been mentioned either by herself or by the pupils she wrote them upon the blackboard. The first topic under consideration was "Newfoundland." The teacher remarked: "Newfoundland is in the North Temperate Zone; the climate is cold-temperate." She then wrote the word "Newfoundland" upon the blackboard and the words "cold-temperate climate" under it. When these words had been written she asked one of the pupils to give the size of Newfoundland. While she was engaged with this pupil the others copied upon their slates what the teacher had previously written upon the blackboard. Those engaged in writing could, of course, pay no attention to what was said by those answering the teacher's questions. When the pupil called upon had given the size of Newfoundland, the teacher wrote upon the board, "Size—about 365 miles wide." When this had been written, the teacher asked a question of another pupil, the others meanwhile copying what the teacher had last written upon the blackboard. This process of copying was kept up until within a few minutes of the end of the recitation period. During the whole lesson no points were developed, no incidents were related, nothing but facts were mentioned.

A few minutes before the close of the lesson the teacher told the pupils to stop writing, after which she asked them some questions relating to the points that had been written upon the blackboard. During this part of the lesson the teacher said, "Children, you need not read the answers from the blackboard if you know them; but I have no objection to your reading them from the board if you wish to do so." When the pupils had finished reading all that had been written upon the board the lesson was over. I asked the teacher what the pupils did with the work on their slates after the lesson.

"Why, they rub it off," was the reply.

"Then why do they copy the words from the board?" I inquired.

"My only object in having them get the lesson in that way," she answered, "is to feel assured that they are all paying attention. Otherwise some of them would pay no attention."

What a peculiar notion!

The third lesson was conducted in the following way: The teacher, after telling the pupils to open their text-books at a certain map, asked them some questions concerning the location of places on this map. The pupils wrote the answers on their slates. This process was continued during the larger part of the recitation period, and during the remaining time the teacher asked the same questions over again, reading them from a text-book, and requested the pupils in answer to read what they had written upon their slates.

These lessons stand in marked contrast to the geography lesson given in my presence by Miss Rich, the first assistant of the Dwight School, which was one of the best geography lessons I ever attended. The recitation was upon Africa. Geography and history were beautifully interwoven, the pupils were full of ideas, and the enthusiasm throughout the lesson was great.

From the descriptions given it is clear that although some of the teaching in the Boston schools is excellent, unscientific teaching is accepted by the superintendents as satisfactory, which means that good teaching is optional and not obligatory and due, not to the activity and progressive spirit of the system itself, but to the fact that some of the principals and teachers are sufficiently interested in their work to do more than is required of them. That the bulk of the teaching is unscientific is evidently, because the vast majority of teachers fail to comprehend the true spirit of modern methods and the principles underlying them.

But why does this weakness exist in a school-system that has labored under particularly favorable conditions for so many years? This, in my opinion, is due to the fact that far too little is done by the superintendents toward inspiring the teachers. In previous articles I have stated that I discovered upon my tour of investigation that the schools of the various cities had advanced in proportion to what had been done by the superintendents toward raising the standard of their teachers by instructing them in educational principles and methods. In Boston, although the number of supervisors is ample (there is one supervisor to one hundred and seventy teachers), nothing is done by them toward materially improving the minds of the teachers, their labors being limited to visiting the teachers in their class-rooms and giving them practical hints on teaching. That the average American teacher is too weak to stand alone, and that the

normal-school influence is soon lost unless she is inspired and instructed by the superintendents after she has received her appointment, is shown almost in its purity in Boston, where such unfavorable influences as politics and "pulls" are at a minimum and the number of supervisors is sufficiently large. That the Boston schools have everything in their favor and yet make a poor showing can, in my opinion, be traced to no cause other than the fact that the instructive and inspiring teachers' meetings are wanting.

There is nothing upon which the superintendents of those cities where the schools are progressive and where the best schools have been developed agree so generally as upon the fact that the main source of inspiration lies in the teachers' meetings. Mr. Balliet, superintendent of the schools of Springfield, Mass., says upon this point: "I devote most of my strength to the teachers' meetings. I find that it is there that I direct the work of the schools most effectively." Dr. Bradley, formerly superintendent of the schools of Minneapolis, says: "At the teachers' meetings I endeavored to get the teachers beyond the methods and devices to underlying pedagogical and psychological principles. I think I was more useful in thus getting almost every teacher to study and investigate for herself than in any other way." Miss Arnold, supervisor of the Minneapolis primary schools, depends largely upon teachers' meetings to inspire the teachers. Miss Cropsey, supervisor of the Indianapolis primary schools, says: "The teachers' meeting is by all means the greatest instrumentality for making progress." In Boston there is a principals' club that meets once a month, the meetings being conducted by the city-superintendent, and there are a few volunteer teachers' clubs that meet from time to time; but the superintendents do not meet their teachers for the purpose of instructing them.

The number of supervisors in Boston is ample for doing the most admirable work through the instrumentality of teachers' meetings. There being only twelve hundred teachers in Boston, the city-superintendent might conveniently meet all his teachers once a month by dividing them into sections of one hundred and fifty and holding two educational conferences weekly. And the assistant-superintendents might readily organize enough classes in psychology and pedagogy to meet all the teachers in smaller bodies once a week. I feel confident that until something is done in this way to stimulate the teachers no material advance of the Boston schools can reasonably be expected.

Boston has for many years had rare opportunities, so that, had the

proper progressive spirit prevailed, its schools might to-day be in advance of all others in the country. Judged by their reputation, it is not at all improbable that they were ahead in previous years. During the last decade, however, there has been a great educational revolution in this country, nearly all the good schools now existing having been developed within that period. It would appear as if the Boston schools had during this time been resting, meanwhile allowing the progressive schools to run ahead of them, leaving them somewhere near the middle of the list. If the Boston educators fail to wake up soon, it is more than probable that before another decade has passed they will find their schools among those at the end of the list. It appears to me that they do not recognize their position. At a principals' meeting I heard a member say in substance that he could not understand why people spoke so much of improving the Boston schools, as, in his opinion, they were already as good as elementary schools could be expected to be. At the same meeting I heard one of the assistant-superintendents remark that the Boston schools were ahead and that they must try to keep them ahead. There certainly is no greater barrier to progress than the feeling that things are perfect. The sooner the Boston educators recognize the fact that their schools can safely stand a material advance the better will be their chances of getting them where they belong.

J. M. RICE.

THE FUTURE OF POETRY.

As a critic Matthew Arnold has moments when he irritates; he tempts one at times to lay hands on father Parmenides. He writes occasionally as if he had bought Truth at a fair, as Englishmen used to do their wives, and had put a rope around her neck and led her away by main force to mutual dalliance. But when all allowances are made, what a victorious figure he appears! Sainte-Beuve, a man of peace, is not comparable with him in effectiveness. His life was one long war against fixed ideas and formulas and flourishing mediocrity. He moved with the confident assurance of the Greek hero, clad first in his own invulnerability and then in the armor of the goddess. His main effort was to impose poetry on mankind. He believed that men and women would be, if not saved, at least made more interesting by an habitual use of poetry. He prescribed poetry for most of the maladies of the age. "The future of poetry," he wrote in his introduction to Ward's "English Poets," "is immense."

It is well to recur to such a word as this at a time when we are all taking stock of our poetical assets, when many people are resignedly prepared to think that we have buried poetry with the poets. One can only quote to those who hold this opinion what Sir Guyon says in the garden of Acrasia to the unfortunate being who prefers to retain his porcine shape when his companions are re-translated into humanity: "Let Gryll be Gryll and have his hoggish mind." It is not necessary to regard such creatures, but there are people not really in need of exorcisement who yet fail to give their days and nights to poetry, and with these we may speak. I desire to write, not a defence of poetry, but a statement of some of its rights, privileges, and ancient immunities. Of writing defences of poetry there is indeed no end. Why does not some one write a defence of prose? It ought not to require argument to compel men to do themselves some particular good, but it does. Nearly all the other arts have an official standing. They are endowed, perpetuated, made part of the apparatus of life. But we are as incredulous of poetry as of the sea-serpent, and the affidavits of those who have seen the thing itself do not convince a skeptical world.

There are those among us to-day who admit the power and persuasiveness of poetry but deny the necessity of the formal art. To them one must try to justify the ways of metre to men. There are those who think that faith, idealism, distinction, the very breath of the nostrils of poetry, the light of her countenance, are no longer possible now that science and material welfare and universal democracy have made us all so happy and so good. To such I must whisper that faith, idealism, and distinction are such admirable inventions that if poetry will help us preserve or win them back we ought all to offer up hecatombs to Apollo. And there are those who, seeing the great luminaries of English verse that assembled toward the beginning of the century and marched almost in a body over the sky of literature now sink one by one under the horizon grave, seeing this great collateral movement, feel that the vigor of the race and the resources of the language must be for a time exhausted. To these it is difficult to reply.

In literature nothing will answer but the actual performance. Yet it may be urged that poems, like men, must come of age before they can acquire a legal status. Neither new poems nor new bottles of wine can have that ethereal flavor, that cobwebbed crust which time alone imparts. Fifty years ago Tennyson was "Miss Alfred," Arnold was "a frog croaking upon Helicon," Hawthorne "one of those visionists." The mass of men feel vaguely that there is a divorce between poetry and plain fact. Poets and the critics of poets have indulged in such airs, have perpetrated such flights into the inane, that honest folk rub their eyes and stare and presently condemn as pure folly a business that makes such pretensions. Mrs. Browning with her chrysms and apocalypses and other ecstatic things which she pours so plentifully on the heads of her poets (and she deals mainly in poets), Tennyson with his injunction to "vex not the poet's mind," and others with more in a like vein, have spread abroad the impression that the largest, most humane, in reality the simplest of arts is a thing suitable only for idiots and children. Poetry has claimed a monopoly, a patent royal over imagination, insight, the feeling for truth and beauty, and has treated prose as a mere squatter on the lands of fancy and romance.

Surely prose, the prose of literature or of life, has an equal estate with poetry in all these fine things, though she may become a poor relation by her manner of handling them. Poetry does not need any usurped possessions, and it were better for her to throw all such back into the hotch-pot and have a fresh and fair division with the other heirs.

I do not see why Shakespeare must needs resign half his wits when writing the divine talk of his comedies, why Milton's imagination does not fulmine behind his high-banked, heaven-filling prose sentences, why Burke should not be the inspired reporter of the Gazette of the World. No, the ideas of men are the common property of language in whatever form it may utter itself.

It remains for poetry to prove that by its use of language it raises such ideas to a higher power, gives them a more lasting effect. Literature was not invented yesterday and the common consent of mankind allows this claim. Thirty centuries of succession have made the throne of literature legitimate in the line of poetry. But some of its causes of superiority are simple, are apparent, are almost elementary to state. To begin with, poetry is the shorthand of literature. Verse tends to concentration, prose to diffusion. The aim of all expression is definiteness, the vivid, instantaneous rendering of the thing thought. Verse by the pregnant lucidity to which its close-packed form compels it, by the images and metaphors with which it seeks to evade the use of many words, attains more successfully and more usually than prose the definite and the concrete. This concentration is an immense advantage. Mankind is on a long march and must discard all superfluous *impedimenta* and content itself with what is easiest carried.

Our memories find themselves more at home with language that has a cadence, a reverberation, an echo, than with unmarked, unmodulated prose. It is the fortune of a pithy saying to be turned to rhythm and tagged with rhyme. The intellects of children begin to walk with the aid of crutches of rhyme, and we older children in our conversation or our writing use the phrases and lines and couplets of the poets as we once did the chairs that helped our tottering steps in infancy. Furthermore, verse has an apparent symmetry, a balance, a proportion of parts which is wanting in prose and seems to answer to some need of the human mind.

There are authors, De Quincey among them, who claim that prose has laws governing its outward form as real if not as rigid as those of verse. But such laws are not discernible to the ordinary eye, and when De Quincey himself tries to exemplify them he seems merely to aim beyond prose and to fall short of poetry. Compared with the drill and discipline of verse, prose has the disorder of a mob, or at least the non-coherent movement of the procession of life in a city street. It may almost be said that verse is to prose as a bird is to the wind in which it floats. One is a complete organism with voli-

tion and power, the other a blind force. Poetry has a motion whose rapidity begets a heat and brightness that prose knows not. In the quickening revolution the wheel of language disappears, the author forgets himself, and we call the result inspiration. In its best moments poetry seems to bring out that harmony which is in immortal spirits, in the order of nature—and dissonance and discord melt in song.

It is unfortunate that such words as song, measure, harmony, and others are indifferently applied to two arts, poetry and music. Music, the Cinderella of the arts, "made in the last promotion of the blest," seems disposed of late to take advantage of this confusion to subject her elder sister to her rule. "If music and sweet poetry agree"—but do they? I cannot see that poetry and music are any nearer related than mathematics and music. All three have in number a common property. In this sense poetry and music may be one, and so may poetry and the integral calculus and poetry and a great many other things. When we reach back to the basal unity we may call it music or what we will, but in this world of difference it is well enough for every tub to stand on its own bottom. For the confounding of things which are essentially separate is the root of all sophistication. An artist who talks of a "symphony in yellow," or a musician who calls his composition a "tone-poem," is on the road to taking a silk umbrella out of a stand in which he has placed a cotton one. The business of *meum* and *tuum* is difficult enough in this enticing world without morality being relaxed in the sphere of art.

Sidney Lanier thought that verse was the art of harmonious sound. In a language like ours where sibilants, and not only sibilants but the dental sounds, hiss like adders, harmonious sound is difficult. Any one who has noticed in congregational singing, where words are pronounced in volume, the hiss which every half-second runs through the house, like the salutation to Satan on his return to the infernal dominions in Milton, must doubt the malleability of words into music. Shelley, in the parlance we have to use, is a musical poet, but he is full of such lines as "In the first, sweet sleep of night," "The earth in fresh leaves drest," which are poetic enough, but fly in the face of music.

A word is an *eidolon*, an image, very much more than a sound. The order of words in verse is a movement, a dance, an intricate procession marching and countermarching, rather than a musical composition. Of course, as words are symbols of everything, they are necessarily symbols of nature's harmonic sound. But it may be remarked in parenthesis that, taken in large, nature seems to be deaf

and dumb. The leaves may whisper as they grow or the stars sing as they roll, but such sounds are not audible. Sound in fact is a minor event in nature's course. If music does not dominate poetry, neither does color nor the art of color. The Greeks, whose mythology is so marvellously acute, made Apollo the deity of both light and music, and modern research establishes the subtle inter-relation of the two forces. Verse uses both but is neither.

Many poets and prose writers have of late descended upon literature with palettes filled with pigment adjectives and have sought to render the effects of nature by direct transference. They seem not to know that poetry may be full of color without the use of color words, nay, may hold itself upright, as Dante said, without adjectives, by the verb and substantive alone. But even with adjectives the greater poets have an indirect way of using them. I have sometimes thought that they employ adjectives of spiritual import when describing material things and words of form and color when the content of the thought is moral or intellectual. This is, however, only a guess. Take Keats for example:

" As when upon a tranced summer night
Those green-robed senators of mighty woods,
Tall oaks branch-charmèd by the earnest stars,
Dream and so dream all night without a stir."

Here is nothing paintable. One cannot paint a "tranced night" or "branch-charmèd trees" or "earnest stars." The poet works by association of ideas, by remote metaphors, by mysterious suggestions, and thereby bodies forth a vision almost more real than reality itself.

I have tried to disengage poetry from those other forms of human expression which threaten to crush it out. Ours is an age of confusion. Nothing is allowed to be unless it is something else. It would save a world of trouble if it were recognized that poetry, in logical phrase, is a method, not a system; that it is a way of handling facts, not any segregated number of facts. We have to confront people who want poetry to deal entirely with emotion, entirely with thought, entirely with psychic philosophy, entirely with a dozen different things. There are critics who think that poetry, like charity, should begin at home, and that Pegasus must pace every inch of his native pasture before breaking loose into the wilds of space.

The claims of locality are especially strong in this country. We insist that our poets shall re-create their art out of their own American heads. I remember picking up a translation of the "Æneid" which

the author had taken the trouble to do in very tolerable blank-verse and happening on a passage in the preface where he nullified his work by protesting that to American readers a single stanza of our own Whittier was worth more than the entire poetry of Virgil. This disposition to make poetry a protected home industry is unfortunate. Nearly all the great poetry of the world was archaic at the period of its production; it sought out remote times and places so that its divine make-believe might have an air of possibility. No creator has ever come into the world without finding a chaos awaiting him, and whether the chaos be within him or without him or beyond him, matters little if he has the power to fill it with order and life. The poet is our modern substitute for the Universal Pan and the whole world is his province, not any special place or time in it.

De Quincey tells of an old Englishman, fond of discussion, who used to say to his guests: "Here I am, in my own house, at my own table, and not one of you has got the common decency to contradict me." Criticism, of late, has lost its gift of contradiction. We follow Sainte-Beuve's method, the method of the mirror, and write appreciations, subtle delineations of single authors; but we do not draw comparisons. Like Frederick's guards everybody in Sainte-Beuve is six feet high, and I am sure I have read the obituary notices of half a score of English writers as great as Shakespeare.

This seems an excessive allowance of greatness for the last half of the nineteenth century. It is barely possible that the constellation of our times will loom so large in the eyes of posterity. Indeed, it is hardly necessary to go back to Shakespeare to confront our late group of poets with comparisons. The great humanity of Burns, the kindling velocity of Byron, Keats' elemental largeness, and Wordsworth's brooding calm seem to some of us vaster poetical forces than our modern masters possess or are possessed by, and their diction has a sureness of ring, a certainty of stamp, which Tennyson alone of their successors has come near matching. Poets must have limitations, as houses must have walls, and readers unfortunately have limitations too; yet the repeated measuring by many minds of author with author will, in the course of time, give us some accurate verdict of the value of each. As Dr. Johnson says, we cannot call a river large or a mountain high save by comparison with other rivers or mountains. It may seem ingratitude to put our benefactors into the scales of measurement, but it is for their final good and ours.

Under correction, therefore, I am inclined to think that the de-

cadence of poetry, which, we are told, set in only when the superior allurements of Darwin and Spencer enticed away romantic readers, can be dated back early in the century. Even Tennyson kicks the beam weighed against any of his robust predecessors. By a sort of eclectic selection he seems to have resumed in himself many of the qualities of his immediate masters, but always with a loss of their primal vigor and freshness. Compared with Keats he is Praxiteles after Pheidias; compared with Wordsworth he is a chanter in a cathedral choir beside a Druid of the dawn. Arnold is a classic, but is he not at the foot of his class? Did ever poet before cast his thought into such perfect mould with so little fire to fuse his materials? Browning, since I must speak my mind without fear of those societies which menace the happiness of mankind and make plain people think that poetry, in Hazlitt's phrase, will bite them—Browning seems destined to take the place of Pope and to vex the minds of future generations (for a very different reason, however) with the query, "Is he a poet?" Whatever Pope's deficiency in matter may be, no one ever questioned his supremacy in words. He sent his verbal shafts with the accuracy of Ulysses through all the rings of opinion until they fastened firmly in his target, the human mind. But it would take an order of the King to put any of Browning's phrases into general circulation. A writer may be stimulating, or subtle, or puzzling, but if he is not a master of language what has he to do with poetry?

To turn from these grappling giants of English verse to their American contemporaries and rivals is like leaving an arena where blood and bruises abound and entering the precincts of a cloister where every footfall is a monition to peace. It is also to tread on dangerous ground. There must be no light jests here. Our patriotism, our fidelity to those who have done us service make us regard our accepted poets as sacred beings. Indeed, the way American audiences treat their poets reminds me of a story which Voltaire, I think, tells of a tribe of Indians, who care nothing for their females as long as these are young and blooming, but as soon as they fall into decay conceive a mighty passion for them, so that with every tooth a woman loses or every wrinkle she gains she is sure of a new adorer.

Promotion with us goes by seniority. We grade the rank of our poets by the dates of their first publications. But distinction once gained, incense and burnt sacrifice is their unfailing due. Murder and arson and blasphemy would be better for our literature than this tepid acquiescence in everybody. The fiery enthusiasm which makes the

respective adherents of Gray and Collins, Keats and Shelley, Wordsworth and Byron want to burn the idols of the opposing camp is utterly lacking in our way of worshipping our poets. Only Poe has strayed into the strife of the world, has been loved and hated, has become interesting. Patroclus got more honor from the struggle of the heroes over his dismembered body than could have come to him by the most unanimous of funerals. One is tempted but has to fly the joy of saying something natural, something real about our American reputations. It may not be. Our poets have been taken as read, they have been laid on the table; by a vote of the majority they are beyond discussion—they are American institutions. Let us honor their names and not venture to ask whether, taken singly or in a body, they can challenge comparison with the masters of haughty Greece or insolent Rome or imperious Albion.

I am reluctant to accept the theory which makes the poet simply a child of his age, a creature of his circumstances. Great poets defy the calculations of average or the laws of evolution. They move the minds of men to make the events we note as epochs, as often as they follow after to record events. But doubtless a ferment of intellect or a rush of action are favorable to the production of poetry. The mountain peaks are lifted up by earthquakes which convulse the globe. Now the greater part of our century has been a time of settlement rather than of upheaval. The things which the revolutions of seventy-six and ninety-three disrooted are getting growth again. Man is taking back into his bosom the kings and dynasties he thought he had got rid of. More than this, he is attempting the laborious, the amazing task of making an aristocracy out of people who have become rich. The masses know what they want. It is material comfort, not equality or power. The next revolution will be for luxury, not for liberty. It is difficult for poetry to become enthusiastic over the distribution of pianos; a capon for dinner every day is not an abstract idea. And such intellectual stir as is known to our time has been inimical to poetry rather than helpful. The hypothesis of evolution, the rationalistic method of inquiry, have done their best to cut the ground from under the feet of faith and idealism. But poetry's killing foe is wealth, and wealth of late has grown beyond the dreams of avarice. Money which can call into existence many of the arts, which can rear architectures, lay out gardens, which can even greatly help in the creation of music and painting—money has no potency over the proud and disdainful Muse.

It is happily ordained for the good of the race that poets shall be miserable. In the old ballads the nightingale always leans her breast against a thorn. I hope there will never be a society for the prevention of cruelty to poets. Even when circumstances are favorable a great poet will manage to get his share of misery. At the highest pitch of his prosperity he will want to retire like Alceste into a wilderness. The comfort and contentment of a well-ordered world can be no joy to one who knows the dark foundations of man's estate; the spectacle of a snug, self-sufficing existence can be no inspiration to him who yearns for greatness and for glory.

One result of the toppling of our faiths in anything greater than ourselves and the vast increase among men of the comfortable belief in their own importance is the comparative disappearance or disesteem of poems of great length, such as are suited to embody the aspirations and instincts of mankind at large, and the production and popularity of lyric poetry in which every human being can utter his own cry of existence. If the process goes on the great epics and dramas of the world will infallibly be gathered into the museums, like the remains of the Pterodactyl or Megatherium, and people will gaze on them with wonder and marvel at the energy of the races which brought forth and endured such gigantic works of art. Every one will be his own poet, and lyrics, those structureless polypes of the sea of song, will be more plentiful than blackberries. Mr. Pater says somewhere, in that celebrated style which one must read with a book-mark, that lyric verse is superior to the other forms of the poetic art because it has a higher unity. It is a curious thought which finds a higher unity in Jock o' Hazeldean than in the Wrath of Achilles or the Fall of Lucifer. But the fact is our minds have become too feeble to take in more than one idea at a time. We can appreciate momentary impressions, the dip of a swallow's wing against the sky, the bending of a flower-stalk; but we are incapable of receiving any impulse from the large, the continuing things of life, from the roll-call of the stars, or the measured march of night and day.

It is ill prophesying when one does not know. The future of poetry is as certain as the future of anything else; but the poetry of the future—to that we cannot give a date or description. At any moment some poet may by a lucky stroke reveal an unsuspected pocket of golden ore and the world will be the richer for it. It may be that the circumstances which seem at war with poetic effort are just those needed to encourage and call it forth. Or we may indulge

the hope that the increasing wealth and luxury of men may have their usual end, and that corruption and decay may set in and flame forth in colors of such grain and dye that poets looking on will dip their pencils in the hues of sunset and eclipse and body forth visions to enchant the coming years. Or they may, penetrated with disgust at the spectacle, tune their lyres to hail the dawning of a purer, simpler time, they may sing of new Saturnian reigns—and so the circle round.

I began this article by quoting with joy a saying of Arnold's; I must end it with a reservation in regard to his position on poetry. When Shelley remarks that poets are the unacknowledged legislators of mankind, the assertion may have a certain vague and indirect truth, but it is impossible of verification in any exact sense. Poems as they have hitherto been constructed are not entirely schools of virtue, nor could any Justinian codify from literature a system of law or ethics which men would care to substitute for their present jurisprudence and morality. Similarly when Arnold expresses the belief that poetry will more and more draw to itself the forces of religion, he fails in that moderation of opinion and utterance which he so much commends.

Poetry is not going to save anybody's soul; that is what religion at least promises to do. Poetry is not the art of administering affairs nor the art of expounding prophecy. It is the art which fills our minds with the happiest and loftiest images and impressions, it is the art which makes us more contented within ourselves and more agreeable to those about us. It has its office to inspire, to charm, to console; its business is to show us that the things of life which most assert themselves to be realities are neither so real nor so important as they claim to be. Its future is immense, because when actualities oppress, when utilities task, when "tired of all these for restful death we cry," we need merely open our books and without struggle partake the strife, without effort to attain the ease, without putting off mortality to have part in the immortality of those sole things which show a semblance of eternal life—the creations of the divine poets. Ponce de Leon sailed far for his fabled Fountain of Youth, but the wiser man is he who reaches down his Homer or his Shakespeare and discovers therein the spring the Spaniard failed to find.

CHARLES LEONARD MOORE.

HOW TO SOLVE THE HOUSEKEEPING PROBLEM.

THERE are two reasons for the turmoil and unrest in American housekeeping. One is the rapid change of fortune, so common in this country, and the other is the difficulty of adjusting the relations of employer and employed in a republic whose people are not free from aristocratic traditions and aspirations. If the essence of democracy is that all things should be at a dead level, the practical working of democracy makes everybody tumble over his neighbor in order to reach that level. Where all the atoms are free to struggle for precedence, social conditions are necessarily as unstable as the sea.

If the reader is not a recent immigrant, but has had some opportunity to observe the course of events in our country, he must have remarked how few families there are who retain the relative social importance they had a hundred years ago. Along the Atlantic seaboard, here and there in the fringe of the thirteen colonies, you may find people living on the same land that their ancestors owned before the Revolution and in relatively the same style. These people are usually outside the largest cities, which are the gathering-places of the new, and they are more frequently found in the North, for south of Washington the Civil War submerged everything.

For the rest of our fellow-citizens change has been the law of life. The course of our successful people may be traced in this way: born in an unpainted cottage on a husk bed, the youth goes barefoot to school, fights his way through college on an empty purse, marries, starts in his profession, and begins to rise. If the infant is born in the city, the chief difference is that he does not stop for an education, but hustles himself into business as soon as he can count. The lower the circumstances of childhood the greater the "bounce" they give the successful man, and the more he delights to boast of them in after-life. The partner of this progressive and, when he has used honorable means, truly respectable citizen is, if he marries young, a woman duly circumstanced like himself, possibly more gently conditioned, and usually of vastly greater social ambition. How must their style of living vary at different periods of life! What adroitness and alert-

ness they must exercise to make their domestic habits keep pace with their expanding fortune! What anxiety lest in an unwary moment they revert to the manner of a previous social condition!

I remember hearing a judge of the Supreme Court say that in his youth he frequently woke on a winter morning and found the bed covered with snow which had sifted in through the rafters, and yet in his age this excellent man found a house with twenty-two rooms heated by steam throughout none too great for his comfort. I know other people, and so must you, who were brought up where the whole family bathed in the kitchen sink. These people in middle age have separate bath-rooms for every member of the household.

Others of our friends began housekeeping without napkins; they now use different finger-bowls for each meal and have their dinner served in courses. It is marvellous how quickly the enterprising American accustoms himself to change of circumstances, even those most deeply impressed on his childhood. We see people who once thought a meal of salt pork and fried eggs a luxury now eating cucumbers in January without a shiver. We may know others that started in married life without a silver teaspoon who now are not content unless they can have strawberry forks and ice-cream knives. This change from a struggle for something to eat and drink to a strife for the most elaborate and luxurious way of accomplishing the eating and drinking is so common that it may be described as almost typical of our American life.

I am not lamenting the good old times. I know that, despite our enormous growth in wealth, social distinctions are far less marked than they were in pre-Revolutionary days. Nothing now commands any particular respect. Official life has lost nearly all its dignity. You may look out of your window and see the Governor of the State hustled off the sidewalk by a small boy. Once the whole school-house would have been drawn up in line and would have courtesied as the great man passed. The professions cannot maintain their precedence. The minister is no longer surrounded by a halo, and the college-president bows before the pork-packer. The editor has become the employee of a corporation. The army and navy, following European traditions, once piqued themselves on social distinction; but the officers are now obliged to marry heiresses to maintain their position, and competitive examinations have thrown open to every one the doors of West Point and Annapolis.

If you wish further proof that our ancestors were not more humble

and lowly in spirit than ourselves, look in Lydia Maria Child's "Frugal Housewife" (your grandmother doubtless had a copy), and there, amid directions for dressing tripe and covering up the pump at night to keep it from freezing, you will find most excellent wise counsel about living within your means, and lamentations over the extravagance of the period, and sage parables showing what becomes of the young people who buy alabaster vases for their parlors when they have not copper kettles for their kitchens. Our grandparents were no better than we, but they had not the opportunities for making money so rapidly, and consequently of creating social confusion on so large a scale. The conditions of life were more simple, and though Thomas Brooks, of Charlestown, might own silver plate whose weight was one thousand dollars (that was their honest way of estimating the value of their flagons and porringers in honest coin), his neighbors never expected to do more than eat their porridge from pewter. Now if everybody does not have silver plate, all have silver-plated, and a steel table fork is almost as much a curiosity as a warming-pan.

The gradual evolution of American housekeeping may best be traced in New England. The log-cabin and garrison-house period may be passed over with a word, because that time is sufficiently remote to have become picturesque, and consequently familiar as the theme of the poet, the romancer, and the antiquarian. Necessity made labor dignified in those days. The men worked in the fields, the women in the kitchen; but both men and women had a great many other occupations besides farming and housework. Both men and women knew the elements of several trades, and they made the things now bought at stores. It is as familiar as a Fourth of July oration to be told that the men used to shoe their ploughs with iron they had hand-wrought, and that the women spun and wove the cloth and household linen.

The next stage of social habits is illustrated by the frame house, examples of which still survive in many parts of New England. The house was built about the great chimney. The kitchen was the main living-room and the scene of all domestic processes. At either end were two small bedrooms, where the family slept because they were nearest the one winter fire. In front were the two "fore" rooms—parlor and "settin'-room," parlor and bedroom, parlor and store-room, as the case might be—and between was crowded a narrow entry with a staircase huddled up against the chimney. The path to the front door was rarely shovelled in winter, and the two "fore" rooms and the

entry were cold storage-vaults, except on rare occasions. Upstairs there was one chamber or more, but the greater part was probably an unfinished loft.

Housekeeping was easy in those days. The family lived in so small a space that house-cleaning was reduced to a minimum. Seldom more than one room had a carpet. There was no *bric-à-brac* to dust, no silver to rub, a half-dozen thin teaspoons being often the only precious metal in the household besides a string of gold beads. There was no upholstered furniture for moths and buffalo-bugs to corrupt, because painted wooden or flag-bottomed chairs often constituted the acme of elegance for the parlor. The family cooked, ate, washed, sat, sewed, and almost slept in the kitchen. No wonder that the housewife could do all the in-doors work, make all the clothes, nurse her children, "watch" with the neighboring sick, knit pillow-cases of stockings, piece scores of patch-work quilts, and braid dozens of rugs, besides finding time to go to meeting, attend funerals, and to lay out the dead.

The transition from the rural frame house to the house with modern improvements, which is the style that governs us now, began with the evolution of the dining-room. I thought at first that it was the stove that was responsible; but the stove and the various forms of cellar heat which have supplanted it were merely incidental and accessory. With the dining-room began "the putting on of style," the ignoring of the process of cooking, the separation of the household into the serving and the served. The kitchen became degraded; it was no longer the centre of family life, Mrs. Katy Scudder's "throne-room," as Mrs. Stowe calls it in "The Minister's Wooing"; it was a distinctly inferior part of the house, and as such was put in the care of inferiors. From this all sorts of specialization were easy. People must have wash-bowls in their rooms; the family ablutions were no longer performed in a tin basin or at the pump in the back yard. They must have a nursery for their children; in old days children were such a recognized adjunct of the family that mothers used to take their nursing infants to sewing-circles, to meeting, and even to balls.

With the specialized house began the rise of the servant-girl problem. In the log-cabin period each family did all its own work, and neighbors sometimes "exchanged." In the next stage families took a child to bring up or hired "help" from neighboring households; the "help" ate and worked with the family. They were of the same nationality and attended the same church. It was as nearly a demo-

cratic state of society as the world has ever seen. Traces of it still survive in our New England villages. Within a few years a lady of my acquaintance applied to the local washerwoman for her services and was refused. "But you do washing for other people?" "Yes," replied the matron of the tubs, "but you have never called on me." Instances like this make us feel that the republic is not wholly gone to decay.

The present state of American household service in the house with modern improvements, outside of the largest cities, may be described as the woman with one "girl." "Servant" the employers sometimes call her, but "servant" is a ludicrous term in the singular number. In the European sense, signifying a wholly distinct class of inferiors, servants are as impossible in a continuing republic as slaves. The change from the "help" of former years to the modern hirelings was accomplished in several ways. The development of the dining-room I believe to be the first cause. As soon as social distinctions began to be made, it was impossible to get American girls. The degradation of household service was completed by the introduction of foreign labor. The change was similar to that which took place in the factories, although the latter was more sudden. I have been told by a friend who lived in Lowell at the time exactly how it took place.

We all know that in the early days of Lucy Larcom American girls of excellent family and superior intelligence were employed in the mills. When summer came these girls, who had been brought up in good country homes, could not endure the heat and confinement of the city. They longed for the green grass and blueberry pastures of their childhood. They had to have vacations or they fell ill. The managers tried the experiment of substituting the robust Irish peasants who were coming in great numbers into the country. When the first Irish girl was introduced into one of the departments of one of the Lowell factories every American girl in the room left. The places were filled by Irish. In this manner room after room was vacated by one nationality and replaced by the other, until in a short time not an American mill girl was left in Lowell. The Irish race has become so assimilated with our own that we may forget how its first ignorant representatives appeared to our rigid New England parents. Alien in thought, habits, and religion, almost in speech, the early Irish immigrants occupied a position at the North almost as distinct as that of the colored people at the South, and "Paddy" had somewhat the same meaning as "nigger."

The quality of any work is ranked largely according to the quality of the person that performs it. When Irish girls were introduced into household service they carried the service down with them. Doubtless other causes besides immigration would have brought about this change. As soon as people began to get money they wished to live luxuriously. They bought fine clothes and found that to wear them to advantage they must refrain from labor. They filled their houses with modern improvements and discovered that the new conveniences required incessant care. Whereas houses in the olden time had dirt cellars and raftered garrets, they now have basements and third stories, painted, plastered, curtained, and as much trouble to keep clean as any of the first-floor rooms. As people became educated and travelled, they observed that life went very comfortably in Europe for the upper classes (to which theoretically every American belongs), and they thought they would try to import a few foreign notions into their own domestic management. Alas for silly human nature, always trying to overreach, to stand on somebody else, to gamble with fate! Our short-sighted newly-rich Americans did not reflect that to have upper-class comforts we must have lower-class service, and that when society is divided into fixed *strata* the state ceases to be a republic.

I suppose that we ought to regard with joy the long wail that goes up from the American household over its one "servant." We ought to contemplate with satisfaction the trials and cares of the mistress and the inefficiency and impudence of the maid. We ought to smile at the struggle for independence going on in the typical republican kitchen. I say "typical," for I do not know how otherwise to characterize the conditions of the mass of intelligent, well-to-do American citizens. If we were to draw our ideas of contemporary social life from the fashionable magazine stories we might believe that the only people living in this country were the families that kept a butler, a brougham, and a summer villa, and that the few outsiders existed only as curiosities among the canyons of the West, the mountain fastnesses of the South, and the remote back towns of New England.

In the absence of statistics I am unable to say whether the single-domestic or one-girl system is the most prevalent style of American housekeeping; but it is certainly the most characteristic. The primitive plan where each family does all its own work is found in every land; but in non-republican countries it is confined to the peasantry, a class that does not exist with us. The complex plan, where each

family supports as many retainers as it can afford, is found among the rich minority of our large cities, who cultivate, as far as they can in a democratic climate, the style of the European leisure classes.

It is to me an interesting fact that the characteristic American type of housekeeping stops at one domestic. In Europe, if people have any domestics, they have at least two. I suppose no English man or woman will ever be able to understand how families may move in society in this country (outside the largest cities) and keep but one maid-of-all-work. The life of the average housekeeper in a New England town is beset with cares and perplexities innumerable. With one domestic, who often cannot perform a single duty without oversight, with the care of the children and the family sewing ever at hand, with unannounced company arriving at any hour, the matron is expected to belong to a literary club, to have her meals served in the style of her neighbor who keeps several servants, to help get supper at the church sociables, to serve as director in the charitable society, and to be ready to receive callers at three o'clock every afternoon.

The last item illustrates the difficulty of the situation. In a rural neighborhood the occasional visitor would bring her work and expect to find her hostess likewise employed. In a large city the matron would have her "day," and having plenty of leisure, would not submit to its infraction. To add to all this, American women in moderate circumstances are probably the best-educated women in the world and the ones most eager for self-culture and most alive to the higher uses of life. The sufferings of such a woman, caught in the vise of the average American housekeeping plan, have been adequately described in only one book, "The Story of Avis." How many thousands of other women, perhaps without the artistic gift of Miss Phelps' heroine, have hopelessly struggled on, scourged by the Puritan conscience and stimulated by the democratic atmosphere, which makes no allowance for inequalities of fortune, strength, or ability, till they have yielded up their sacrificed lives!

Why do not American women keep more servants? To many people this would seem only an aggravation of the evil. It is enough to have one ignorant, wasteful, dish-breaking, relation-feeding foreigner in our homes; with two we should be obliged to seek shelter elsewhere. But suppose competent domestics could be obtained: their expense would place them beyond the reach of all but rich families. In no country is domestic labor so well paid as in America, and in no country is the service so unsatisfactory. Before the Civil War the

regular wages for the ordinary maid-of-all-work was one dollar and a half a week. Now the most ignorant importation from a European hovel, who does not know a dust-pan by sight, who "does not prefer" to wash, who will break and burn at pleasure and stop up the sink-drain without remorse, cannot be induced to come and board in any family at less than three dollars a week.

But the wages paid are the smaller item of expense. Where is the family that would dare offer in the kitchen any less costly fare than appears in the dining-room? In Europe the servants do not dream of eating the same food as the people whom they serve. In America a separate table applies to time and place only, never to things to eat. As Americans live better than any other nation, and as the cook has the first choice of everything brought into the house, the cost of the food of the average domestic probably exceeds her wages in every case.

Household service is better paid than almost any other manual labor performed by women. It is done under more comfortable surroundings than many kinds of work in factories, in sewing-rooms and shops. It must be the natural lot of the larger portion of women who marry. "Why, then," exclaims the woe-begone housewife, "is it impossible for me, willing to pay high wages, to get any trustworthy, efficient service in my kitchen?"

When people lament that intelligent, self-respecting girls will starve at any other occupation before entering household service, I think of the orations delivered at agricultural fairs. The city magnate, lawyer, banker, politician, or whatever he may be, comes out into the country, extols the beauties of rural life, exhorts the boys to stick to the farm, and exalts agriculture as the noblest occupation under the sun. I always wonder at the boldness of the speaker and at the meekness of the audience. I wonder that they do not punctuate every period with a chorus of "Why don't you try it yourself?" He knows and they know that nothing earthly would induce him or any other man wishing a comfortable income to depend upon one-horse farming for a living. He knows and they know that there is no political economist like the man who has got ahead in the world and wishes to restore the balance by shoving his fellows behind. He knows and they know that no occupations are so much to be shunned as those which editors and orators are always urging other people to undertake. The fault with farming is that it brings in no money. The fault with household service is that it commands no respect. Mr. Bellamy is not the only writer who has rebuked our inconsistency

in compelling those within our power to perform certain necessary labor and then in despising them for doing it. People will fight for glory who cannot be hired for money. The Sisters of Charity shrink from no service, however loathsome, because spiritual enthusiasm goes with it and honor is the reward of their order. Many women will cook in the homes of the poor on account of the romance of benevolence who would feel abused if they had to do the same work for their own families. So long as servants are regarded as a distinct class, separated from the rest of society by insuperable barriers, so long will there be no health in the social body.

The only way to make cooking, cleaning, and the other forms of housework respectable is to have this labor performed by respected people. Education or training is the first step in raising a workman in esteem. We ought to profit by the history of the trained nurses. A friend of mine visiting in Ottawa a few years ago was rather surprised to meet at various social assemblies a trained nurse who, as the guest of Lady L—, was the heroine of the hour. Knowing that the English are not wont to treat governesses or other cultivated people in their employ with special consideration, the American girl could not understand the enthusiasm with which the profession of nursing was regarded. The conservative English adopt some new ideas more quickly than we, but few Americans need to be told that nursing is now looked forward to as a profession by hundreds of American girls of good families and refined antecedents. The work is often hard and sometimes of the most menial order; the nurses have to wear uniforms when on duty, and they must become members of others' households; but their knowledge gives them recognized authority, and their service in saving life confers on them a badge of merit.

Another kind of service has lately risen in dignity because it has been taken up by cultivated people. At the summer resorts in many parts of the country, notably at the White Mountains, the dining-room attendance has passed into the hands of college students and local school-mistresses. A quick eye, a steady hand, a sure foot, and a long memory are the essentials for a skilful hotel waiter, and these requirements are admirably met by our keen-witted youth who are struggling for an education. Their position is recognized by those guests whose wealth is not recently acquired. I lately happened to be seated at table under the shadow of Chocorua with a gentleman who was a cosmopolitan of Colonel Higginson's description—at home even in his own country. Being familiar with the society of Euro-

pean capitals, this gentleman appreciated the social conditions of different peoples. When the pretty waitress, evidently the village school-mistress and probably a descendant of some Revolutionary soldier, came for orders, the gentleman at once addressed her as "Miss."

The great reason why housework is repugnant to self-respecting Americans is not so much on account of the work itself, for other kinds of labor are hard and monotonous, but on account of the conditions under which it is performed. The single domestic lacks society; she is isolated from the family life and she can never call any time her own. Girls will work all day amid the steam of a laundry, the fumes of a factory, the bad air of a sewing-room, because there they have companionship, their hours are defined, and they are their own mistresses when the day's work is done. It is impossible to have these conditions in domestic service except in very wealthy families, and there the workers must be branded as servants. As there is every probability that house-wages will go higher rather than lower, and as the girls will not come to the houses, the houses must go to the girls.

In thickly-settled communities with modern apparatus it is becoming more and more practicable to have household labor done outside the house. There is an immense waste of force in the average kitchen. The time, labor, and fire spent in cooking a dinner for a small family would often suffice for one four times as large. It is possible to make a great reduction in the kinds of food that need to be cooked at home. One important item that might be eliminated is bread-making. Everybody, except on remote farms, has given up the making of butter, and it is needless to state that the creamery grade is far superior to the average home-made article. The quality of bread could probably be as much improved if it were made scientifically in large quantities from the best material.

Other departments of housekeeping besides cooking can be handed over to skilled outside labor. All kinds of carpet-cleaning, rug-beating, and window-washing can be hired by the hour in cities. Even such daily routine as dusting, lamp-trimming, and dish-washing can be performed in the same way. Work of this sort in elegant houses must be done by people of intelligent minds and careful fingers who understand the value of costly *bric-à-brac*. It has opened up a new occupation for women of refinement suddenly thrown upon their own resources. If we could get rid of the old feudal idea which we inherit from England, that we must feed and lodge and exercise a paternal

control over all people in our employ, we could specialize our work to our own advantage and the self-respect of our domestics.

The latest phase of American housekeeping, which throws a hopeful side-light on the situation, is the "girl-bachelor" establishment, which is springing up in all our large cities. This method is probably derived from the customs of art-life abroad, where economy is so well understood, combined with a reminiscence of the girl's own school or college experience, when tempting spreads were evolved in one's study-parlor over a gas-stove.

This is the way one of a trio of young college women, two of whom had earned the degree of Ph.D., describes their family life in her class letter:

"We hire a house of eight rooms. [It was in the country.] All our laundry work is done outside. Our bread is sent up from the city. [Observe that bread-making is always given up when people are trying to live simply.] On Saturdays we hire native talent to come in and scrub. We have a boy to tend our furnace and do our chores. The rest we do ourselves. [They were all engaged in teaching.] Come and see us. Our house is made of India-rubber, and I wish you could taste my chicken croquettes."

There are hundreds of little flats in New York and other cities where two or more bright business and professional women have joined forces and solved the housekeeping problem, independent alike of the boarding-mistress and the servant-girl. Such a way of living does not admit of ostentation, hardly of ceremony; perhaps, like Mrs. Whitney's "Real Folks," the ladies may dine in their kitchen or "kitch" in their dining-room. But we may be hopeful about the future when people of culture are willing to perform the humble tasks of every day.

FRANCES M. ABBOTT.

IMMINENT DANGER FROM THE SILVER-PURCHASE ACT.

ON December 26 last, Mr. Foster, the Secretary of the Treasury, announced that in three weeks \$12,000,000 of gold had been sent abroad, all of which was taken from the Treasury. "Bradstreet's" reports that on the nineteenth of that month "the New York share market reached the verge of panic. Rates for called loans touched forty per cent." It was almost impossible on that day to borrow money in New York except with the agreement to repay in gold. The month of December has for twelve years past, with one exception, shown an excess of imports of gold, which have averaged \$3,800,000. Ordinary trade conditions at the present time furnish no reason for the exportation of gold. The fact that the stringency of the money market on December 19 was relieved by large loans of sterling exchange in New York by foreign bankers indicates that the causes for the exportation of gold are internal, and the financial journals of the country are agreed that the silver-purchase act of July 14, 1890, is directly responsible for the disappearance of gold from our country and the state of alarm which prevails in the money market.

Fear is an element in monetary conditions which may be as serious in its effects as reason, and the experience of last December indicates a dangerous state of uneasiness in financial circles. It has, however, been an evil in the discussion of our monetary questions that temporary and surface indications of disaster have been too often made the basis of argument. The greatest weapon which the inflationist legislators have had in discussion has been the repeated failure of predictions of disaster. It would be well if at last the business community were aroused to the contemplation of easily determined conditions which will bring us to the edge of a crisis only when the inevitable forward movement makes the crisis inevitable.

It is hardly realized by bankers themselves what an enormous change has taken place in the last five years in the relation of our

paper money to the gold which is available for redemption purposes in the Treasury.¹

Taking the last official statement of imports and exports of gold and silver for the five years preceding the 1st of December, 1892, it appears that the net exports of gold for the five years have been \$147,000,000, an average in round numbers of \$30,000,000 each year. In the same time the net exports of silver have been about \$64,000,000, or about \$13,000,000 annually. If, as is estimated, the net product of gold for five years available for coinage purposes has been \$95,000,000, it appears that we have sent it all abroad and drawn upon our accumulated gold to the extent of \$52,000,000. Our Treasury has since 1888 lost \$79,000,000 of gold. In the same time the Treasury has added \$168,000,000 to its silver fund.

The critical nature of our present situation appears not only in the smallness of our gold reserve, but in the constantly diminishing supply to the Treasury of gold through the legitimate channel of the collection of duties. From the Treasurer's report, No. 23, it appears that in November, 1889, the gold receipts from customs at New York

¹ The following table will illustrate approximately the change which has taken place. We had on June 30, 1892, in round numbers, which will serve best in such a discussion, the following uncovered notes for which gold may be called on demand :

United States legal-tender notes.....	\$346,000,000
Fractional currency and old demand notes.....	7,000,000
National bank-notes for redemption	27,000,000
Treasury notes, law of 1890	102,000,000
Silver certificates	331,000,000
A total of.....	\$813,000,000

We had on June 30, 1892, of available gold \$114,000,000, or fourteen per cent of the notes liable to redemption ; the available silver fund was \$448,000,000, or fifty-five per cent of such notes.

Only four years ago, on June 30, 1888, the corresponding notes were as follows :

United States legal-tender notes.....	\$346,000,000
Fractional currency and sundry demand notes.....	16,000,000
Silver certificates	229,000,000
A total of.....	\$591,000,000

There was then of available gold in the Treasury \$193,000,000, or thirty-three per cent of the redeemable notes ; of silver then available there was \$280,000,000, or forty-seven per cent of such notes. In other words, the percentage of available gold has fallen since 1888 from thirty-three to fourteen and the percentage of silver risen from forty-seven to fifty-five.

were 92.6 per cent of the total receipts. In November, 1890, the percentage of gold payments had fallen to 80.4 per cent; in November, 1891, to 43.5 per cent; and in November, 1892, to 7.8. In the six months preceding the 1st of December, 1892, the average of gold so paid to the Government was less than nine per cent of the total payments. It thus appears that gold payments at the custom-house by debtors of the Government have substantially ceased, and if the same fact holds in the department of internal revenue, for which returns are wanting, it may safely be said that the Government can no longer rely for its gold reserve upon the ordinary avenue of collections.

It must not be forgotten that of the gold in the Treasury \$100,000,000 are substantially pledged to the redemption of the outstanding legal-tender notes, amounting to \$346,000,000. If this fund be held inviolable, the appalling fact presents itself that we have \$467,000,000 of Government promises outstanding which have only \$14,000,000, or about three per cent of gold available for their redemption.

The recent heavy drafts upon the Treasury of gold for exportation are a sufficient reminder that even in the ordinary course of business two or three weeks may exhaust this whole fund in excess of the legal-tender reserve. When this occurs the Secretary of the Treasury must face the question of issuing bonds to maintain the good faith of the country. There is much thoughtlessness in the talk of the purchase of gold with bonds. It is forgotten that this purchase must be made from abroad and with the cooperation of the banks if they are to avail anything. If the Treasury merely buys gold from our banks they can at once secure their gold again by presenting government notes for redemption in gold. If we drained gold from Europe the conversion of our securities into money and the disruption of the money market would be likely to follow.

The movements of foreign countries toward a gold standard have been small, slow, and cautious, but nevertheless have disturbed the money market. Indeed, the results of an issue of United States bonds to secure gold may be well dreaded in the financial world. From all the present uncertainty we may be relieved by repeal of the silver-purchase act. It would be an announcement that this Government will no longer experiment or trifle with its gold standard, and our ability to maintain the present silver-circulation would not be questioned.

At the present time our Government stands in the market to take the total product of the mines of our country, saving that which is used in the arts, and every ounce of silver purchased is hoarded in

the Treasury vaults. So long as a gold standard is maintained our hoarded silver is worse than worthless. It cannot be sold for gold, as there are no purchasers. Even to begin the sale of our hundreds of millions would wreck the silver market and shake the world's finances. When silver was in full repute, Germany, by slow sales, disposed of \$140,000,000 and reduced the world's price from fifty-nine and one-half pence to fifty pence. Our silver hangs, therefore, as a dead weight in the arms of the Treasury, unavailable for redemption of government promises and a threat to the world. Yet we continue to buy it at the rate of nearly \$1,000,000 a week.

There is no reason to suppose that, under any legislation which may be enacted for the use of silver as money, the fluctuations in the market price will be materially affected. What a silver standard means to the country appears in the fluctuations of silver during the last fiscal year. There was a variation in the price during the year from \$1.016 to \$0.855 per fine ounce. The value of the silver contained in the silver dollar varied at these prices from 78.6 cents to 64.2 cents, showing a difference in the price of silver of sixteen cents an ounce and in the value of the dollar of nearly thirteen cents. The total of the silver coin and bullion stock in the United States is placed by the Director of the Mint on the 1st of July, 1892, at \$570,000,000. A variation of thirteen cents on the dollar represents the enormous amount of \$74,000,000.

The Comptroller of the Currency in his last report admitted that the 378,000,000 silver dollars coined under the law of 1878 had on October 31, 1892, a bullion value of only \$250,000,000, and showed a difference between the actual cost of the metal and its market value of \$57,000,000. He admitted that the silver bullion accumulated in the Treasury under the purchase act of 1890 at a cost of \$116,000,000 showed a depreciation in two years of \$14,000,000. Upon his showing, therefore, the country has actually lost in its purchase of silver in round numbers \$71,000,000, and in the last two years has lost at the rate of \$7,000,000 a year.

The silver dollar, which, at the enactment of the law of 1878, was intrinsically worth more than ninety cents, is now worth but sixty-three cents. The ratio between silver and gold, which was in 1872 about fifteen and one-half to one, is now about twenty-five to one. Supposing that our Government in 1890, instead of providing for silver purchases at a loss of \$7,000,000 a year, had devoted this seven millions to the purchase of gold, we could have offered a bonus of

two per cent upon importations, or issued two per cent bonds, and secured with seven millions of dollars \$350,000,000 of gold. Instead of this, we have been driving gold from the country and losing money in the accumulation of a metal which would be more valuable at the bottom of the sea than in our Treasury vaults.

If the law for the purchase of silver is repealed without qualification we shall then find, for the first time, what its natural price is, and if we continue to use it as a money metal we ought to approach the market like any other customer at a price which is not certain to fall continuously by virtue of the fact that we are a permanent customer.

If we reduce silver at once to a normal price we shall only do that with safety now which we must eventually do at a terrible sacrifice, to wit, liquidate our assets. And indeed, under our present system, maintaining as we do gold redemption of all our obligations, it is not material whether our silver dollar is intrinsically worth ninety cents, sixty-three cents, or fifty cents. It is material, however, that we shall not continue to accumulate assets which by our very accumulation are bringing us to a disastrous liquidation or to a silver standard of payments. It ought now to be settled whether we are to remain upon a gold standard or pass to a silver standard. The transition from one to the other will be more expensive with each year, first, because the more silver we acquire the greater will be our loss, and, secondly, because the continuation of paper inflation may go deeper even than the question of the silver standard and imperil our national credit.

It must not be expected that the repeal of the law of 1890 will be allowed to pass into a law without a most desperate struggle, because that law appeals at once to both branches of the silver supporters in Congress. The inflationist would see the expansion of the currency stopped and the silver-mine owners would lose their single customer. The contest will be more severe even than that which was made upon the Bland and Stewart bills in the late session of Congress. The struggle, when it comes, will be Titanic and final. The inflationists and the mine-owners will win, unless at last there is an uprising of the business men of the country, the organization of an army to march upon the mischief-makers at Washington; with this victory can be secured.

The National Silver Committee will throw its forces and money again into the struggle; appeals will be made through subsidized newspapers to alarm the timid and excite the ignorant. The stake for which the silver interests play amounts to more than the forty-five

millions of dollars which they receive from the Government for their otherwise useless product; their market in the next year and the years following as well is involved in this contest. They will not see that the cessation of silver purchases by Government would compel the whole world to join in the restoration of silver or share with us the shrinkage in money value. On the other hand, the business men of the country must insist that our monetary system be no longer prostituted to the support of a single interest.

If the silver-purchase law is repealed, silver will fall in price and many mines must be closed for a time at least. Well, why not? If each man answers this question for himself he will understand his own position better and profit by it. Is he consulting the financial interests of the country, or has he indeed become a party to a private scheme to make a single commodity more valuable at the expense of the people? Does he look with more complacency on a nation plunged into repudiation and disaster than on the closing of a few mines which are maintained out of the earnings of a tax-burdened people and out of the treasury of a government which is on the verge of borrowing to meet its legitimate obligations? The Farmers' Alliance plan is even better. Grain, tobacco, or cotton would be available assets with which to redeem government promises, because the world is buying each and all of them; but silver is now mined to no purpose, except that the owners may make a profit and the financial world be made to suffer more with every dollar they produce out of the Pandora pits. Why shall the world be made any longer a sacrifice to the prosperity of the silver-miners? Their ores will not rot or wear out; their wealth will merely lie fallow.

The time has come for the business community to lead a contest, regardless of politics, against the spirit of recklessness or indifference in which politicians are dealing with our monetary system. Those who have been making the fight in Washington for honest money have made it substantially without cooperation or assistance from the great interests involved in their contest. Appeals for this cooperation have been met even to the present day with the statement that if the moneyed interests take an active part in the agitation of public sentiment, the cry of "gold-bug and moneyed aristocracy" will be raised in Washington and will lend strength to the hands of inflation and class prejudice. It is high time that this error gave place to the truth. Such a plan of fighting insures defeat. The attack should be made not only upon the existing evils in our currency system, but to

prevent the repetition of compromises which have in the last twenty years only substituted one evil for another. The silver law of February 28, 1878, was a compromise with the greenback and silver inflation sentiment of that time and the silver-purchase act of July 14, 1890, as a political compromise with the silver interests of the West.

Recent political history ought to suffice as proof that the country is now ready for an aggressive movement to restore our currency to a sounder basis without compromise or concession. In the late election Mr. Cleveland abated nothing of his declared hostility to silver inflation and achieved a notable victory even in the very sections where inflation was supposed to have its greatest strength and to be fatal to the chances of any candidate who did not yield to it. The opening of the Fifty-second Congress indicated a certain majority in favor of the free coinage of silver. The Senate alone seemed doubtful, yet, in the House, a contest as bitter as has been known within a party for a generation resulted in the overwhelming defeat of free coinage, while a drifting, timid policy in the Senate resulted in the passage of a free-coinage measure. If, previous to the vote upon the Bland bill last March, the business men of the country had through their banks, their boards of trade, clearing-houses, and other organizations given warning to their representatives in Congress that they would no longer tolerate any trifling with our monetary system, we should not have been brought so near to peril as a tie vote, and a basis would have been laid for sound legislation at the second session. Yet it is a surprising fact that not one business man or organization appeared before the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures to raise a voice against free coinage. At the present time the most potent argument in Congress against the repeal of the law of 1890 is that the whole matter of monetary legislation should be postponed to the Fifty-third Congress. Unless the business interests of the country arouse themselves at once, it is not certain that even the Fifty-third Congress will not be encouraged by the remarkable apathy of our merchants and bankers to refuse again to act, or what is worse, cast upon some new compromise.

It is not so important to discuss in public prints the necessity for the repeal of the silver-purchase act as it is to convince business men that they alone can secure that which politicians cannot wrest from Congress. How long will political candidates be permitted to bid boldly for the votes of the Farmers' Alliance and presume with im-

punity upon the indifference of the great commercial interests which, if but slightly organized, could make or wreck the fortunes of political candidates throughout the land? The repeal of the silver-purchase act is an issue upon which a definite contest can be made between sound money and inflation. In the efforts which have thus far been made toward a repeal, a single question has been repeated by the "silver-men" so often as to give a plain indication of the situation. "What," it is asked, "do you propose to put in place of silver purchases?" There never was a time more opportune to answer definitely this question with the single word, "Nothing."

GEO. FRED. WILLIAMS.

NEGRO SUFFRAGE A FAILURE: SHALL WE ABOLISH IT?

THE relation of the Negro to the State and Federal Governments is yet an unsolved problem. Since slavery was abolished efforts have been made, some earnest, some not earnest, at a satisfactory solution; but all have been alike experimental and unsatisfactory, pleasing neither the men who made them nor the Negro for whom they were made. The first step taken to solve the Negro problem was the adoption of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which enfranchised the slave. This was one of the earnest efforts. This amendment was the work of men who were moved solely by a desire to do justice to the Negro without doing injustice to the white man, to benefit the late slave without profit to themselves. At the time of its adoption it was received with great bitterness by a large majority of the people of the South, who refused to give its authors credit for their real motives, but attributed its enactment solely to enmity toward the people of the States lately in insurrection. Of course it is useless to say that this feeling has long ago passed away, and the Southern people credit this amendment to its real and proper motive.

The next move made was the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment, which, so far as it concerned the Negro, provided for his civil rights directly, and indirectly sought to secure him political rights by depriving a State which should deny him the right to vote of a portion of its Congressional representation. This measure was largely the work of men who were seeking advantage for themselves, using consideration for the Negro as a pretext. This was the first insincere effort to solve the problem. The next effort was the adoption of the Fifteenth Amendment, the effect of which was to clothe the Negro with political rights and absolutely to prohibit any State from denying him the electoral franchise. But twenty months had elapsed since the adoption of this amendment—not time enough to observe its practical workings, nay, barely time enough for it to get into practical operation—and yet this radical change in the fundamental law was made. This last amendment was purely a political move, made in the interest of a political party, without a thought of its ostensible

beneficiary, the Negro, and was then and is yet, with one exception, which will be touched upon later, the shallowest of all the pretences made of a desire to solve the Negro problem.

Under these amendments, acts of Congress were adopted peculiarly for the benefit of the Negro and intended to give him advantages enjoyed by no other race. He was made the ward of the nation. A special bureau was created to watch over him and his interests. Special laws were enacted intended to guard his right to vote and to have his vote counted. In short, the Negro became the object ostensibly of special solicitude. This was a degree of concern shown for no other race in the country. The Caucasian was and is left to get along as best he can under the ordinary operation of general laws. The native American Indian has no constitutional amendment nor legislative enactment making him a citizen and voter. The despised Mongolian, so far from being made either citizen or voter, is prohibited from becoming a resident. It was reserved for the African race, as a mass the lowest of the four races, to have its privileges made the highest and the most carefully provided for.

Thus there has elapsed more than a quarter of a century during which efforts have been made to solve the Negro problem by legislation along the line of enforced political equality between the races, and all these efforts, without exception, stand forth confessed failures. The problem yet remains unsolved. To the question, "Why?" I would answer that in attempting its solution the legislators seem to have lost sight of the great fact, shining forth from every page of modern history, that "where the Anglo-Saxon sets his foot there he rules." Into the reason for this there is no necessity to inquire. It is enough that the fact exists. Nor does the relative numerical strength of the races in any locality seem to have aught to do with it. Cast away upon an island inhabited by savages a rude, unlettered American or British sailor, and, if the natives do not eat him within twenty-four hours, in five years he will be king of the country. Whether it be upon the icy surface of Plymouth Rock or on the burning sands of India, from the moment the Saxon's foot pressed the soil, his domination begins. It is only with due regard to this fact that the Negro problem is capable of solution. While the Federal power has been engaged for more than twenty-five years in an effort to overturn this immutable truth with the "be it enacted" of the National Legislature, the people most directly affected have been steadily engaged in nullifying that effort and in trying to solve the problem

along the line of white supremacy. There are two ways in which this has been tried: the legal way and the illegal way.

I shall first consider the legal way, although chronologically it comes second. The only effort made, within the law, to deprive the Negro of the suffrage was the incorporation into the Constitution of Mississippi of what is known as "the educational qualification for voting." Briefly stated, this requires a voter to be able to read the Constitution of the State "or to understand the same when read to him." There is no concealment of the fact, nay, it is openly and candidly avowed, that the sole purpose of this clause in the fundamental law of Mississippi is to exclude the Negro from the ballot-box. In the first place, nine out of every ten white men who cannot read can understand what is read to them. The contrary is true of the Negroes. In the second place, the question whether or not the illiterate applicant for the suffrage can "understand the same when read to him" is left to the judgment of the election officers, and it is no more difficult to imagine what this judgment would be in the case of the illiterate Negro than it is plain the very power which framed the article intended that this judgment should be so exercised. This is the "shallowest" subterfuge to which I have already referred. Of the motives of the people of Mississippi and of the subject of their justification, a word later.

Let me now consider the illegal methods which have been resorted to in the efforts to solve this problem. These methods all resolve themselves into one effort, namely, to prevent, by illegal means, the Negro from controlling public affairs by his vote, which legally he has the right to do if he is in the majority. This effort has not been confined to any one State nor any particular section: it has been made wherever the Negro has been found in sufficient numbers to be a factor in political affairs. It is not a question of locality, it is a matter of race. The means used are not always the same: sometimes it has been fraud, sometimes it has been force, sometimes it has been bribery. In some places the leaders among the Negroes have been paid large sums to deliver their followers in blocks. This is easier perhaps than people not acquainted with the Negro imagine. As a rule, the Negro leaders have given out the tickets to be voted to their followers at the Negro churches on the Sunday previous to election day. Each Negro jealously guarded his scrap of paper until he deposited it with his own hands in the ballot-box. As but few of them could read (and those few were known to the leader), there was nothing

easier for the leader to do than to give out the opposition ticket instead of the ticket the Negroes thought they were receiving; and there are instances without number where this was done—for a consideration in cash. In other instances white rule was obtained by a fraudulent count after the close of the polls, either by a substitution of their ballots for those actually cast or by a total disregard of the ballots. Cases of this sort, however, were not nearly so numerous as people north of Mason and Dixon's line have been led to believe. In other cases intimidation was practised before the election, and the Negroes were given to understand that they could not vote for candidates representing the principle of Negro domination. There is no need to discuss the methods employed. We are dealing only with results, and the result in cases of this sort was that the Negro either stayed away from the polls and did not vote at all, or else he voted an open ticket for the candidates standing upon the platform of white supremacy.

I do not propose to discuss the right or the wrong of this suppression of the Negro vote, nor do I propose to enter upon any defence of the white people of the South for such suppression. Their defence is found in the fact that their civilization was threatened and they felt that they *must* defend it. Mistaken zealots and unscrupulous politicians had left them only the choice between a Hayti in the heart of the United States or a resort to some one of the methods outlined above. They chose, and I believe they chose with wisdom. Self-preservation is not only the first, but it is also the great, the overshadowing law of nature. In the face of the most strenuous efforts by those who did not understand the conditions, in the face of the fact that their State governments were in the hands either of the Negroes or of white men who represented Negro domination, in spite of all the power of the Federal Government available for the purposes of prevention, the white people of the South, by some of the means referred to above, overthrew Negro rule, even where the Negro was in the majority, and all over the South they have established the rule of the white man.

These are the simple facts, plainly stated, without any attempt to gloss them over or to apologize for them. What are we to deduce from them? I do not mean what opinions of the past, but what lesson for the future? The history of what has gone before has no value save as a guide for what is to follow; the record of the errors of the past is useless save as a finger-board for the present.

If the white people of the South, impoverished by war, bound and

hampered by adverse legislation directed solely against them, with large numbers of their voters disfranchised and all their offices in the possession of the men who advocated Negro domination, were able to overthrow that domination and assert the principle of Saxon supremacy, can any reasonable man suppose that those people, with all these embarrassments removed and all the conditions reversed, will ever consent to the subversion of the principle in which they believe and consent that intelligence shall again be ruled by ignorance? There can be but one answer to this question. It is equally clear that, with a part of the people attempting to work out the solution upon one line and the rest attempting to work it out upon another and diametrically opposite line, it will never be solved. The only hope for its solution rests in a united effort by all the people working solely for that end and without regard to sectional advantage.

But before we attempt to discuss a common line of action, or rather as a prelude to that discussion, let us take a look at the political results of the counter-efforts which have been made. The political result to the Negro may be disposed of in a word—Nothing. He stands just where he did twenty-five years ago—a cipher on the political blackboard, valuable only when controlled by other figures, and in nowise affecting the result by reason of his own worth. The result to the country generally has been to add a certain number of votes to the number necessary in the Electoral College to choose a President and to increase the membership of the lower house of Congress. The result to the Southern States has been to give them a greater weight than before in Presidential elections and to add to their influence in the Federal legislature; while the result to the Northern States has been correspondingly to reduce their representation and influence. And the same are the results to the two great political parties. The Republican party, by the Fifteenth Amendment, made for itself a club to use in political warfare. The Democratic party has now wrested that weapon from its grasp and is biennially using it to batter its maker.

This naturally leads us to the remedy for the existing state of affairs. In politics, as in all other matters, the base-line both of motive and of action should be honesty. That expediency which permits wrong to be done that right may come of it has no more place in the science of government than in morals; and in politics, as in mathematics, the shortest line to any point is the direct one. In taking the direct line to the successful solution of the Negro problem,

the two great bodies of workers will each have to abandon something, to surrender some of the ground which it occupies. The Northern idea of Negro political equality must be abandoned; the Southern advantage of additional political representation must be surrendered. This resolves itself into a repeal of the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and a remission of the question of qualification for the suffrage to the several States.

This is no new theory. Upon every sort of qualification save that of race the several States have the undisputed right to pronounce. Upon the age of the voter, his residence in the State, in the country, in the ward and in the district, his mental qualifications, in some instances his property, and even upon the voter's sex, the State alone decides without interference by the National Government. Why should race alone be an exception from the general rule?

It is a favorite answer to this question that a man's race is a thing for which he cannot be held responsible, and that therefore a State should not be permitted to disfranchise him therefor. Neither can an individual be held responsible for his or her age or sex, yet both are permitted to be made qualifications or disqualifications by a State. The illiterate condition of a candidate for the elective franchise may be and frequently is the fault, not of the man, but of his parents; yet he suffers therefrom. Why, then, I ask again, except the matter of race from this general rule of State control? That this action would be consonant with what is the acknowledged doctrine of the Democratic party cannot be disputed. Remission, or rather reservation, of as much of the power of government as is possible to the several States has always been and always will be the corner-stone of Democratic faith. I think it can be demonstrated that it is in line with the principle upon which the Republican party also won its first national victory. The issue upon which Abraham Lincoln was first elected President was the claim made by the Republican party that the decision of whether a State should be a "free" State or a "slave" State should be left to that State itself at the time of its admission into the Union. I take it that the matter of personal liberty, the question of man or chattel, is much graver, much more important, than a decision upon a question of political privilege. And if it were the doctrine of the Republican party to submit the graver question to the decision of the State, would it not be stultification to refuse to so submit the lesser?

The effect that the repeal of the Fifteenth Amendment would

have is obvious. Such States as chose to debar the Negro from participation in elections would, under the operation of the Fourteenth Amendment, be deprived of such votes in the Electoral College and such seats in the National House of Representatives as were based upon the disfranchised Negroes. But the matter would be left entirely to these States. If Louisiana, for instance, desired to retain her eight electoral votes and her six members of the House of Representatives, she would leave the Negro a suffragist. If she desired (as she does) white supremacy within the law, she would surrender two or three of her Congressmen and a corresponding influence in the choice of a President.

To the white people such legislation would be a blessing. Criminations and recriminations over "bulldozing" and ballot-box stuffing would cease. The moral sensibilities of the people, which have unquestionably been blunted by the practices toward the Negro, into which they have been forced by dire necessity, would regain their normal tone, and we might hope for a return to that purity of politics which is now a tradition of the times of our fathers. To the Negro it would be no less a blessing. I put aside the matter of his personal safety and his freedom from molestation and consider the change as affecting him from a political point of view only. In a State where the color-line was drawn he would cease to be the political nightmare of his white neighbors and a political enemy to be held in a state of political siege. In many of the States, while the color-line would be drawn, the law would doubtless be so framed as to permit such Negroes as could qualify themselves by intelligence and thrift to step across it, and this incentive would result in the moral, material, and mental improvement of the race. To the whole country the gain would be still greater. Parties could then differ and men range themselves into parties upon questions of political economy and governmental functions; sectional lines would be wiped out, and a man's opinions, not his residence, would decide his political affiliations. The whole country would be made the Presidential battle-ground, instead of two or three States being selected as the field of the political trickster and the market of the political corruptionist. The purchase of the Presidency, which is possible where but one or two States are to be bought, would be an impossibility with forty-four States in the doubtful column.

I claim no originality for this method of solving this problem. I believe that it has suggested itself to the minds of many. The trouble

has been that no one has cared to incur the possible odium which might attach to him who should suggest it. But once proposed (and by "proposed" I mean formulated and presented for action), I believe it would be overwhelmingly approved. There is no doubt that it would meet with opposition, especially from some Democrats of the Northern States, who would be unwilling to surrender the electoral vote in the Southern States which would be thereby lost, and from some Republican leaders in the Southern States who are factors in the political sum only by reason of the Negro ciphers that stand behind them. But I believe that this opposition, together with that of those whose misguided zeal for the Negro would lead them to do him the injury of keeping him in his present condition, would be overcome by the vast majority of the people of the country who desired to settle forever the Negro problem on the basis of the good of the whole country and the benefit of both races, regardless of the effect of such settlement upon individual, sectional, or party interests.

JNO. C. WICKLIFFE.

A PRACTICAL REMEDY FOR EVILS OF IMMIGRATION.

THE discussion of the subject of immigration has now reached a stage when the calm consideration of rational and practical measures for the protection of this country must take the place of wholesale denunciation, wild theories, and impracticable propositions. That serious economic questions are involved in the problem is now more or less clearly realized by those who have heretofore not paid much attention to the important part taken by immigration in our material development, and whose apprehensions have been raised by the continuous stream of foreigners landed on our shores, and more recently by the possibility of the introduction of disease. The advocates of a total prohibition of immigration, or of such severe restriction as practically to result in shutting off the stream, now ask themselves if our country is prepared to dispense with the material that has developed its resources, that builds its railroads, works its mines, clears its forests, and performs the many different kinds of coarse menial labor for which native Americans cannot be hired. Every branch of activity in the land, in fact every American household, is deeply interested in this question and would be seriously affected by any radical measure aiming to cut off or materially to obstruct the supply of labor and of domestic service that our native population does not and will not render for many years to come.

The fact is perceived that there is a mode of treating this important question more befitting the dignity of an enlightened nation than the application of anti-Chinese legislation to European people, and that we can fully protect our people without taking action that will be disastrous to our own vital interests. I refer to the regulation and sifting of immigration as distinguished from total or partial prohibition, and as one who has by long experience in the ocean transportation business acquired some knowledge of this matter I venture to give the results of my observations with regard to it.

In most of the public discussions of the question there seems to have been a tendency to confound the subjects of immigration, quarantine, and naturalization, and to treat them as *one* question,

whereas each should be considered by itself; and although related, the measures called for to meet the exigencies of one do not apply to the other. Yet it is true that by a judicious enforcement of quarantine regulations and by changes in our naturalization laws, many of the evils now laid by an indiscriminating public at the door of the poor immigrant can easily be remedied.

In view of the probability of the reappearance of cholera in Europe with the approach of spring, the question of quarantine is at present of the gravest importance to the United States, and it appears of the utmost necessity that measures should be adopted to prevent the introduction of this disease through the medium of immigration. Heretofore it has seemed to be the policy of the Government, in times of pestilence, to rely entirely upon a quarantine at the port of arrival, where all passenger-carrying vessels have been held for an indefinite period, irrespective of the condition of the ports from which they sailed, of the countries from which the passengers came, or of the health of the passengers themselves. It has been proposed, as an effective measure of precaution against cholera, to prohibit the landing of any steerage immigrants in this country for the period of one year, while permitting American citizens, travelling in the steerage from Europe, to land unmolested, presumably because they will in some way be free from the infection carried by a foreign immigrant in the same class. The fatal objection to this radical measure is that which must be urged against any prohibition of the migration of people into this country. As long as our frontier lines on the north and south are not closely guarded and watched a large mass of immigrants will pour into this country, and if deflected from our Atlantic seaboard to Canadian ports and sent by railroad along our four thousand miles of frontier, they will slip into the United States at innumerable points without passing any quarantine. The risk of the introduction of disease will be increased tenfold under this condition of affairs, and instead of a measure of security, a new element of danger will be created. There are at present three well-equipped lines between Canada and Europe prepared and willing to take any business they can get. Canadians are by no means opposed to immigration and will welcome any immigration traffic through their territory, in the hope that they may glean something from it. Canada's uniform policy has been to encourage and stimulate immigration by cheap fares, and the Dominion has gone so far as to pay bounties to secure settlers.

The only rational way to solve this quarantine problem is to place the quarantine at the *port of departure* and there to hold the steerage passengers, under control of the United States consuls or of other United States officials, for such length of time as medical science shall consider necessary to effect a thorough disinfection of the person and of the baggage of the immigrant. When this is done and the quarantine at the port of departure is supplemented by a careful observation during the voyage and a searching examination on arrival, no lengthy quarantine on this side will be required, and the possibility of the introduction of disease will appear to have been absolutely removed.

The objection may be made that the United States has no power to enforce a quarantine in a foreign port of departure; but on closer examination this objection will be seen not to apply. It is true that this country can have no jurisdiction over foreign vessels in their home ports, but these foreign vessels regularly run to our ports and can be forced, if they do not comply with a quarantine requirement of the United States such as described at the port of departure, to undergo a lengthy quarantine on arrival, the mere threat of which will be sufficient to insure compliance, as no steamship line would for an instant hesitate to choose a quarantine of steerage passengers at the port of departure and before embarkation rather than a long detention of vessel, cargo, cabin and steerage passengers at the port of arrival. The United States Government, therefore, actually has absolute power to prescribe and enforce a quarantine or period of observation in the home port. Aside from this, however, it is of the greatest importance to the steamship lines to avoid any infectious disease, such as cholera, and as a matter of self-interest alone, apart from any other consideration, they would welcome any measure or adopt any precaution that should insure their passengers and their vessels immunity from the epidemic, for the occurrence of a single case of cholera on a steamship line is sufficient, in the present state of the public mind, to ruin the business of that line for an indefinite period of time.

As a case in point, I refer to the North German Lloyd Steamship Company, which company, early last summer, when the cholera threatened to advance from Russia into Germany, voluntarily instituted, and still carries out, a rigorous quarantine of all its steerage passengers at the port of embarkation for a period of five days before departure, during which time these passengers are under the careful observation of a corps of physicians acting under the control of the United States

consul. These physicians closely examine every passenger several times daily and supervise the disinfection of their baggage by sulphur and steam. The lodging-houses in which the passengers are kept are under the constant surveillance of the police, the health-officers of the port, and of these physicians. They are specially licensed by the steamship company for the reception of the company's passengers, and in case of non-compliance with the rules of the police, health, and medical authorities, under whose constant control they are, they are deprived of the privilege to lodge the steamship company's passengers. At the same time that these precautions were adopted the same company placed an additional ship's doctor on each passenger steamer and prescribed a most rigorous system of inspection and careful diet on board during the voyage. The result of these regulations, adopted without compulsion and solely with a view to avoid any possible case of cholera on the steamers of this company, was that not a single case occurred, although the company's port of departure, Bremen, is within two hours by rail of the infected city of Hamburg.

The details of such a quarantine at the port of departure can be left to the United States Government. The regulations established by it should be carried out by the United States consul and by physicians under his supervision, and he should be required to certify to the execution of the requirements prescribed by his Government. If the port of departure is not infected, a careful observation and disinfection in the ordinary lodging-houses should suffice; but if infected, a strict isolation in special buildings used for that purpose should be required.

The Committee on Immigration of the United States Senate recently addressed an inquiry to nine of the most eminent physicians of New York City as to "what means, if any, connected with immigration, should be at once adopted to prevent the introduction of cholera during the coming year." In reply, seven of these distinguished gentlemen recommended a quarantine or period of observation and disinfection at the port of departure of five days or more, with careful scrutiny during the voyage, as the most effective means to prevent the introduction of cholera. This opinion of the highest medical authorities in the country on the measures to be adopted against cholera ought to be conclusive.

A great variety of measures have been suggested for the regulation of immigration. A favorite theory appears to be the inspection of intending immigrants by United States consular officers in Europe,

and many people seem to consider this a feasible and desirable method to regulate immigration and to prevent the admission into this country of objectionable persons. In reality, this system, far from obtaining the results expected from it, namely, the sifting of immigration and the exclusion of those who would not be valuable acquisitions to this country, would give *us* the dregs and enable the countries of Europe to retain their able-bodied citizens. Consular inspection must take place either at the port of departure or in the district whence the immigrant comes. The inspection at the port of departure could be only a matter of form, as no opportunity there exists for a proper investigation of the character and antecedents of the immigrant. Nor could any statements made by the immigrant at the port of departure to the consul be verified or their correctness ascertained. Any examination of immigrants by consular officers must of necessity take place in the districts where the intending immigrants live, and the consul must inevitably rely entirely upon information obtained from the home authorities with regard to the qualifications of immigrants applying for consular certificates. These local authorities could, of course, not be compelled to certify to the character of the immigrant; it should be purely voluntary on their part, and in view of the natural desire on the part of foreign governments to prevent able-bodied men liable to military service and desirable citizens from immigrating, it is most natural to suppose that no favor will be shown to the good, but that the undesirable elements will be certified to with alacrity, the result being that those who are infirm or objectionable will easily obtain their certificates, while the healthy and morally fit will find it extremely difficult to obtain the testimonials required by the consul.

Most European immigrants come from agricultural districts and are widely dispersed over a large tract of territory in the various countries of Europe. It is obvious, therefore, that it will be an impossibility for the small number of United States consuls in these country districts in any way to control or examine into applications for certificates. Russian Poland, from which more than twenty-five thousand have annually immigrated of late years, contains but one consulate; Hungary, from which the annual immigration approximates thirty thousand, is also provided with but one consulate; the entire dual kingdom of Norway and Sweden contains four consulates. It is inconceivable that, even with a large force of officials, a proper and reliable examination of the immigrants in their various districts, many

hundred miles distant from the consulate, could be made. The Italian immigrant is now obliged to obtain a passport to enable him to leave his country, and under the Italian law such passports cannot be given to criminals. Yet the experience of the United States immigration authorities at New York shows that of the immigrants returned from the port of New York as criminals a large proportion was Italian, and all of these had been provided with the regular passports by the Italian authorities. The United States Commissioner of Immigration at New York reports the case of an Italian who arrived on December 7, 1891, and whose landing was prohibited on the ground that he was a person convicted of a felony and who had served out a sentence of ten years' imprisonment in the prison at Ancona for robbery. This undesirable immigrant had in his possession the regular passport, duly signed, sealed, and stamped, and on the back of the passport was printed in the Italian language an extract from the United States laws prohibiting the landing of criminals, insane, etc. This is a sample of the reliability of certificates based upon information received from the home authorities in Europe. It is clear that a system of this kind would not only result in the very reverse of what it is intended to obtain, but would degenerate into a most lamentable farce.

Another plan for the regulation and restriction of the immigrant traffic consists in the demand of a money qualification, the proposition most frequently suggested being that every immigrant arriving in this country should possess the sum of one hundred dollars. A requirement of this kind would exclude the very classes the coming of which the large majority of our citizens desire to encourage, namely, the Scandinavians and Germans, equally with those nationalities who are generally considered less capable of early assimilation with our people. The Swedes, Norwegians, and Danes, comprised under the general head of Scandinavians, show the smallest number of illiterates among all the nationalities that arrive on our shores, about six per thousand, or slightly more than one-half of one per cent. The average amount of money or money's equivalent brought into this country by these Scandinavians is about twenty-two dollars per head. The Finlanders, a most intelligent and desirable Scandinavian race, possess on an average about fourteen dollars a head; the Germans in the neighborhood of thirty dollars per head. According to the statistics of the United States Immigration Bureau, showing the money possessions of arriving immigrants, out of two hundred and

two thousand immigrants over twenty years of age who arrived in the port of New York from January 1 to November 1, 1892, one hundred and ninety-four thousand would have been excluded if the money qualification of one hundred dollars had been enforced; and it is interesting to observe that out of thirty thousand Scandinavians twenty-eight thousand nine hundred and thirty-five, and out of thirty-one thousand Germans twenty-eight thousand, would have been unable to obtain permission to land in this country. It is therefore safe to say that a money qualification of any considerable amount would virtually prohibit immigration.

An educational qualification, *i.e.*, the admission of only those immigrants who are able to read and write in their own languages, if it could be enforced, would, while admitting Scandinavian and German immigration, undoubtedly exclude large numbers of other nationalities; but a test of this character hardly appears practicable. Nor does it seem desirable, as it would shut out from this country a large part of the coarse labor material that we require.

The regulation and sifting of immigration can most readily and efficaciously be carried out through the steamship companies and their agents in Europe. These agents are scattered in great numbers throughout the large districts in Europe from which immigration comes. They are under the direct control of the companies, subject to the regulations of these companies and to the stringent laws of their countries, as well as under the supervision of government officials, and are required to possess licenses before they are allowed to transact a passenger business. They can, therefore, be held by the steamship companies responsible for any objectionable persons whom they may accept as passengers, and can be subjected to fines and penalties for any violation of the regulations and rules issued by the United States Government for the admission of immigrants into this country. The agent is in most cases personally acquainted with those who apply for passage, and is in fact the only one who is in a position to obtain reliable information with regard to the immigrant. If it is made his personal interest to avoid the booking of any person who may by his return involve him in pecuniary loss, he may be relied upon to be extremely circumspect before issuing a ticket.

A formula should be prescribed by the United States Government for the examination of intending immigrants by the agent in Europe, and the immigrant should be required to answer satisfactorily questions that will prove his right to admission upon landing in this country.

He should be warned that, in case the answers he gives should prove incorrect upon further information or examination on arrival here, he will be returned; and he might be required upon arrival here to swear to the answers he has given if his case appears doubtful. A requirement of this kind, with the prospect of punishment for perjury, would undoubtedly operate as a wholesome deterrent. The United States Government, although unable directly to reach the agent in Europe, thus has complete control through the steamship company landing the passenger here. The steamship company can be and should be held responsible for the immigrant, and in case it should appear that the status of the immigrant was incorrectly given, the steamship company should be obliged to return him, and would fall back upon the agent through whom the passenger had been booked. In case any wilful violation of the regulations on the part of the agent or connivance with the immigrant is shown, the steamship company would be liable to a fine or penalty, which it would proceed to collect from the guilty agent. The steamship agents in Europe are now more or less familiar with the requirements of the United States laws governing immigration, and are now held by the principal steamship lines responsible for persons accepted by them in violation of the present regulations. They are therefore in a position to apply any further stringent rules that may be prescribed by our Government.

In connection with the proposed plan for the regulation and sifting of immigration through the agents of steamship lines in Europe—recommended by the United States Commissioners of Immigration, the Hon. J. B. Weber, and Dr. Kempster—the term during which immigrants who, after landing in this country, become burdens upon the public or are discovered to belong to the interdicted classes, can be returned, should be extended beyond the present period, one year. The steamship companies should be obliged to return such immigrants at any time within such period as may seem proper to protect our poor-houses, insane-asylums, and other institutions. This would provide an additional protection and safeguard, and is also recommended by the United States immigration authorities.

The principle upon which it is proposed to place the system of quarantine and immigration inspection is by appealing to self-interest to secure the regulation of the immigration traffic and its inspection at its fountain head. The examination by the agents of steamship companies in Europe is intended to sift immigration in the countries

where it originates, as an aid to the inspection upon the arrival of the immigrant in our ports. The opinion is frequently expressed by those who have not examined the process of the inspection of immigrants upon arrival that this inspection is lax. This, however, is a mistaken idea. A comparison of the present inspection at New York with that of the State Board of Commissioners of Immigration, prior to the assumption of the immigration business by the Federal authorities, shows a most marked change in the rigor of the examination. During the last five years of the control of immigration by the State Board, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-seven immigrants were returned to Europe; whereas, during the last two years and seven months that have elapsed since the United States authorities have taken charge of immigration matters at the port of New York, three thousand nine hundred and eighty-eight persons have been prevented from landing and have been returned to Europe. Under the regulations of the former State Board of Immigration, such immigrants as fell into distress within twelve months of their landing were assisted at the expense of the immigrant fund, resulting from the head tax paid by the steamship lines. In the year 1889, the last year during which the State Board of Immigration had control, there was an average daily attendance of such immigrants of two hundred and sixty-six. The Federal authorities, upon assuming charge of the immigration business, continued the practice of assisting distressed immigrants out of the immigrant fund, and the average daily number so assisted during the year 1892 fell, by reason of the stricter application of the immigration laws, to sixty, showing that the inspection of arriving immigrants at this port, under the able administration of the present Commissioner of Immigration, Colonel Weber, is not open to the charge ignorantly made by thoughtless critics.

The fear is frequently expressed that immigration will endanger our political institutions. If there is ground for this apprehension, the remedy lies in extending the time of naturalization and providing that citizenship shall be predicated upon an educational requirement. Under the present laws of many of our Western States, immigrants are naturalized after six months' or one year's residence in the country. If any real danger threatens from this source, an extension of this period of time will afford an effective safeguard, and naturalization should be taken from State control and intrusted to a Federal bureau. The labor force that we require for our material needs should not be intrusted with the franchise until properly conversant with our form

of government and imbued with the spirit of our institutions. It is admitted here solely for the purpose of doing the low grade of work for which it is indispensable and which cannot be furnished from our native stock. It should, however, be rigidly excluded from any participation in our Government until it has reached a stage of political intelligence that will place it on a par with the American.

If sanitary protection is afforded to our country by a careful quarantine of immigrants at the port of departure, if by holding the steamship companies and their agents strictly responsible for the sifting of immigration before embarkation, supplemented by examination upon arrival, and if, by guarding the avenues to citizenship, the integrity of our institutions is preserved, immigration need have no terrors for us, and we may continue to receive the beneficent stream to which we owe in large measure the present development of our country.

GUSTAV H. SCHWAB.

WRITERS FOR THE FEBRUARY FORUM.

MR. DAVID A. WELLS (*Tariff Reform: Retrospective and Prospective*) was born in Springfield, Mass., in 1828, and was graduated at Williams College in 1847. After a brief experience on the editorial staff of the "Springfield Republican," he took the scientific course at Harvard as a special pupil of Louis Agassiz. He was an assistant at Harvard and a teacher of science at Groton until 1857. During the next few years, he compiled several scientific works which won for him a wide reputation. In 1864, he published a political essay entitled "Our Burden and Our Strength," that created much discussion both in America and Europe. In 1867, after investigations in Europe as a member of a Governmental commission sent to study industrial conditions, he became a free-trader. He has since been a member of several Governmental commissions, has assisted as an expert in the management of railroads, and has written voluminously on economic subjects.

MR. WILLIAM EDWARD HARTPOLE LECKY (*The Art of Writing History*), born in Ireland in 1838, was educated at Trinity College, Dublin. In 1861, he published anonymously his first work, "Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland." Then he turned his attention to philosophical subjects, and in 1865 his "History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe" appeared, and won for him a place among the leading thinkers of the day. In 1869, he published a "History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne." For the next ten years he devoted himself to the preparation of a "History of England in the Eighteenth Century," the first two volumes of which were issued in 1878. He now holds an established position as one of the leading historians of our time.

DR. JOHN SHAW BILLINGS (*Medicine as a Career*), born in Switzerland County, Ind., in 1838, was graduated from the Miami University in 1857 and at the Ohio Medical College at Cincinnati in 1860. He became medical inspector for the Army of the Potomac and later librarian of the Surgeon-General's Office in Washington. In 1880, he was made president of the American Public Health Association. He has published many official medical reports, and contributed occasionally to the magazines.

MR. F. MARION CRAWFORD (*Emotional Tension and the Modern Novel*) was born in Lucca, Italy, in 1854, and educated under private tutors in Rome, at St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H., at the University of Cambridge, England, and at the German universities. After travelling extensively in Europe and in the East, he came to New York, and in 1882 he wrote his first novel, "Mr. Isaacs," which at once leaped into popularity. He has since resided chiefly in Italy, and he has published many novels, among them "Dr. Claudius," "A Roman Singer," "Zoroaster," "A Tale of a Lonely Parish," "Saracinesca," "The Witch of Prague," and "Don Orsino."

SIR SPENCER WELLS (*How to Prevent the Coming of Cholera*), born in St. Alban's, England, in 1818, was educated at Trinity College. He studied medicine at Dublin, Leeds, and at St. Thomas' Hospital, London. He began his career as a surgeon in the navy and distinguished himself during the Crimean War by his services in the hospitals of Smyrna and Rankoi. After his return to London he won eminence for his treatment of the diseases of women. He was vice-president of the Royal College of Surgeons in 1879-1880, and in 1883 he was made president of the college and a baronet.

DR. J. M. RICE (*The Public Schools of Boston*), born in Philadelphia in 1857, was graduated from the New York College of Physicians and Surgeons in 1881. He took a course of psychology and pedagogy at the universities of Jena and Leipsic, after which he visited the schools of various European countries. Dr. Rice, in the service of the FORUM, has visited the public schools in thirty-six cities, spending every school-hour in school-rooms, making the investigations upon which he has based these articles.

MR. CHARLES LEONARD MOORE (*The Future of Poetry*) was born in Philadelphia in 1854. He has been engaged chiefly in railroad work both in South America and in the United States. He has published several volumes of prose and verse. His "Day Dreams: A Century of Sonnets," was discussed by Dr. S. Weir Mitchell in the FORUM for June, 1892.

MISS FRANCES M. ABBOTT (*How to Solve the Housekeeping Problem*) was born in Concord, N. H., where she has always lived. She was graduated from the Concord High School in 1875 and from Vassar College in 1881. She has done considerable newspaper work and has contributed to the "New England Magazine," "Wide Awake," and other periodicals.

HON. GEORGE FRED. WILLIAMS (*Imminent Danger from the Silver-Purchase Act*), born in Dedham, Mass., in 1852, after his graduation at the Dedham High School in 1868 and at Dartmouth College in 1872, studied at the universities at Heidelberg and Berlin. In 1875, he was admitted to the Bar. He was elected as a Democrat to the Massachusetts Legislature in 1889 and to the Fifty-second Congress. He has edited "Williams' Citations of Massachusetts Cases" and several volumes of the "Annual Digest of the United States."

MR. JOHN C. WICKLIFFE (*Negro Suffrage a Failure: Shall We Abolish It?*) was born in Lexington, Ky., in 1854, and removed to Louisiana in 1881. He has been for several years one of the leading lawyers in New Orleans and was until recently editor of "The New Delta," a paper devoted to the suppression of the Louisiana lottery. Mr. Wickliffe has taken an active interest in all matters affecting the welfare of the South, and he has, at great personal sacrifice, been one of the foremost men in the movement against the Louisiana Lottery Company. In the FORUM for January, 1892, he contributed an article on the history of that organization.

MR. GUSTAV H. SCHWAB (*A Practical Remedy for Evils of Immigration*) was born in New York City in 1851. He studied for nine years in Germany, where he received his business education. Since 1876 he has been a member of the firm of Oelrichs & Co., American agents and representatives of the North German Lloyd Steamship Company, of Bremen, Germany, and has personally managed the affairs of the company in this country.

INDEX TO THE FOURTEENTH VOLUME OF THE FORUM.

- ABBOTT, FRANCES M. How to solve the housekeeping problem, 778.
- A Chinaman on our treatment of China, 85.
- ADAMS, CHARLES FRANCIS. Municipal government: lessons from the experience of Quincy, Mass., 282.
- ADAMS, HENRY C. Popular education at the University of Michigan, 123.
- ADDAMS, JANE. A new impulse to an old gospel, 345.
- ADDAMS, JANE. Hull House, Chicago: an effort toward social democracy, 226.
- Alarming proportion of venal voters, the, 1.
- ALDRICH, N. W. The McKinley act and the cost of living, 242.
- A practical remedy for evils of immigration, 805.
- Are Scott, Dickens, and Thackeray obsolete? 503.
- Artistic triumph of the fair-builders, the, 527.
- Art of writing history, the, 715.
- "A tariff for revenue": what it really means, 51.
- BABCOCK, KENDRIC C. Scandinavians in the Northwest, the, 103.
- BACON, HENRY. Shall the State-bank tax be repealed? 571.
- Baltimore: our public-school system, evils in, 145.
- BILLINGS, J. S. Medicine as a career, 725.
- BLACK, CHAUNCEY F. The lesson of Homestead: a remedy for labor troubles, 14.
- Boston, the public schools of, 753.
- Brandy and socialism: the Gothenburg plan, 514.
- BROOKS, JOHN GRAHAM. Brandy and socialism: the Gothenburg plan, 514.
- Campaign committees: a plan for more effective management, 39; publicity as a cure for corruption, 26.
- Can moral conduct be taught in schools? 673.
- CANNON, H. W. For whom I shall vote and why, 402.
- Career, medicine as a, 725; politics as a, 445.
- CARROLL, H. K. Religious progress of the negro, 75.
- CHADWICK, J. W. Why the fair must be open on Sunday, 541.
- CHAMBERLAIN, JOSEPH. Municipal institutions in America and England, 267.
- Chinaman on our treatment of China, a, 85.
- Cholera, how to prevent the coming of, 743; the lesson of preceding epidemics, 133.
- Church, the enlarged, 67.
- Civil-service reform: a decade of the merit system, 216; a review of two administrations, 201.
- CLAFLIN, JOHN. For whom I shall vote and why, 397.
- Columbian exposition, Sunday and the, 194.
- Committees: a plan for more effective management, campaign, 39; publicity as a cure for corruption, 26.
- Corruption, campaign committees; publicity as a cure for, 26.
- Cost of living, the McKinley act and the, 242.
- CRAWFORD, F. MARION. Emotional tension and the modern novel, 735; what is a novel? 591.
- Crisis in silver, the, 553.
- DAVIS, E. MEANS. The matter with the small farmer, 381.
- Decade of the merit system; civil-service reform, a, 216.
- Dialect in literature, 465.
- Dickens, and Thackeray obsolete? are Scott, 503.
- DOYLE, JOHN T. Civil-service reform: a decade of the merit system, 216.
- EDMUNDS, GEORGE F. Politics as a career, 445.
- Education at the University of Michigan, popular, 123.

- Education has failed, wherein popular, 411.
- Effort toward social democracy ; Hull House, Chicago, an, 226.
- ELIOT, CHARLES W. Wherein popular education has failed, 411.
- Emotional tension and the modern novel, 735.
- Endowed theatres and the American stage, 337.
- England, literary and municipal problems in, 644.
- English views of the McKinley tariff, 310.
- Enlarged church, the, 67.
- Fair-builders, the artistic triumph of the, 527.
- Fair must be open on Sunday, why the, 541.
- Farmer, the matter with the small, 381.
- FARRER, THOMAS H. English views of the McKinley tariff, 310.
- FAWCETT, MILLICENT G. Women in English politics, 453.
- FIELD, DAVID DUDLEY. For whom I shall vote and why, 403 ; the primary the pivot of reform, 189.
- For whom I shall vote and why, 390, 393, 395, 397, 398, 401, 402, 403.
- Free trade ? has England profited by, 324.
- French political stability and economic unrest, 653.
- Future, of poetry, the, 768 ; the literature of the, 178.
- GEFFCKEN, F. H. German socialism and literary sterility, 660.
- GIBBS, HENRY HUCKS. The crisis in silver, 571.
- GLEED, C. S. The wealth and business relations of the West, 631.
- Gospel, a new impulse to an old, 345.
- Gothenburg plan ; brandy and socialism, the, 514.
- GOULD and socialism, Jay, 686.
- Government : lessons from the experience of Quincy, Mass., municipal, 282.
- HADLEY, ARTHUR T. Jay Gould and socialism, 686.
- HARRISON, FREDERIC. Literary and municipal problems in England, 644.
- HARTER, MICHAEL D. Campaign committees ; a plan for more effective management, 39.
- Has England profited by free trade ? 324.
- History, the art of writing, 715.
- HOLDEN, EDWARD S. What we really know about Mars, 359.
- Homestead : a remedy for labor troubles, the lesson of, 14.
- Housekeeping problem : how to solve the, 778.
- HOWE, E. W. Provincial peculiarities of Western life, 91.
- How should a city care for its poor ? 474.
- How to prevent the coming of cholera, 743.
- How to solve the housekeeping problem, 778.
- Hull House, Chicago : an effort toward social democracy, 226.
- Immigrants contribute to industry, what, 600.
- Immigration, a practical remedy for evils of, 805.
- Imminent danger from the silver-purchase act, 789.
- Indianapolis, the public schools of St. Louis and, 429.
- Institutions in America and England, municipal, 267.
- JAY GOULD and socialism, 686.
- Laborers in Pennsylvania, the mine, 110.
- Labor troubles, the lesson of Homestead ; a remedy for, 14.
- LECKY, W. E. H. The art of writing history, 715.
- Lesson of Homestead : a remedy for labor troubles, the, 14.
- Lesson of preceding epidemics, cholera : the, 133.
- LEVY-BRUHL, L. French political stability and economic unrest, 653.
- Library of the United States, the, 369.
- Literary and municipal problems in England, 644.
- Literature, dialect in, 465.
- Literature of the future, the, 178.
- LOTI, PIERRE. The literature of the future, 178.
- MACVEAGH, FRANKLIN. For whom I shall vote and why, 395.
- MALLOCK, W. H. Are Scott, Dickens, and Thackeray obsolete ? 503.
- Mars, what we really know about, 359.
- MASHAM, LORD. Has England profited by free trade ? 324.
- Matter with the small farmer, the, 381.
- MCCLURG. For whom I shall vote and why, 398.
- MCCOOK, J. J. The alarming proportion of venal voters, 1 ; venal voting : methods and remedies, 159.
- McKinley, act and the cost of living, the, 242 ; tariff, English views of the, 310.
- Medicine as a career, 725.
- Michigan, popular education at the University of, 123.
- Mine laborers in Pennsylvania, the, 110.

- MODJESKA, HELENA. Endowed theatres and the American stage, 337.
- MOORE, CHARLES LEONARD. The future of poetry, 768.
- Moral conduct be taught in schools? can, 673.
- Municipal government: lessons from the experience of Quincy, Mass., 282.
- Municipal institutions in America and England, 267.
- Necessity for a national quarantine, 579.
- Negro, religious progress of the, 75; suffrage a failure: shall we abolish it? 797.
- New impulse to an old gospel, a, 345.
- New York City, the public-school system of, 616.
- New York, special needs of the poor in, 492.
- Next great problems of science, the, 42.
- Northwest, Scandinavians in the, 103.
- Novel, emotional tension and the modern, 735; what is a, 591.
- PALMER, G. H. Can moral conduct be taught in schools? 673.
- PARKER, GEORGE F. What immigrants contribute to industry, 600.
- PEABODY, F. G. How should a city care for its poor? 474.
- Peculiarities of Western life, provincial, 91.
- Pennsylvania, the mine laborers in, 110.
- Plan for more effective management, campaign committees: a, 39.
- Poetry, the future of, 768.
- Political stability and economic unrest, French, 653.
- Politics, as a career, 445; women in English, 453.
- Poor, how should a city care for its, 474; in New York, special needs of the, 492.
- Popular education at the University of Michigan, 123.
- POTTER, H. C. Sunday and the Columbian exposition, 194.
- Primary the pivot of reform, the, 189.
- Problems of science, the next great, 42.
- Progress of the Negro, religious, 75.
- Proportion of venal voters, the alarming, 1.
- Provincial peculiarities of Western life, 91.
- Publicity as a cure for corruption, campaign committees, 26.
- Public schools, of Boston, the, 753; of St. Louis and Indianapolis, the, 429.
- Public-school system, evils in Baltimore, our, 145; of New York City, the, 616; schools of Buffalo and Cincinnati, our, 293.
- Quarantine, necessity for a national, 579.
- Reciprocity, the Republican policy of, 255.
- Reform, retrospective and prospective, tariff, 697; the primary the pivot of, 189.
- Religious progress of the Negro, 75.
- Remedy for labor troubles, the lesson of Homestead, a, 14.
- Republican policy of reciprocity, the, 255.
- "Revenue": what it really means, "a tariff for," 51.
- Review of two administrations; civil-service reform, a, 201.
- RICE, J. M. Our public-school system: evils in Baltimore, 145; our public-school system: schools of Buffalo and Cincinnati, 293; the public schools of Boston, 753; the public schools of St. Louis and Indianapolis, 429; the public-school system of New York City, 616.
- RIS, JACOB A. Special needs of the poor in New York, 492.
- RILEY, JAMES WHITCOMB. Dialect in literature, 465.
- ROOD, HENRY. The mine laborers in Pennsylvania, 110.
- SAYRE, LEWIS A. Cholera: the lesson of preceding epidemics, 133.
- Scandinavians in the Northwest, the, 103.
- SCHIFF, J. H. For whom I shall vote and why, 393.
- Schools of Buffalo and Cincinnati, our public-school system, 293.
- SCHOULER, JAMES. For whom I shall vote and why, 390.
- SCHWAB, GUSTAV H. A practical remedy for evils of immigration, 805.
- Science, the next great problems of, 42.
- Scott, Dickens, and Thackeray obsolete? are, 503.
- SHAKESPEARE, E. O. Necessity for a national quarantine, 579.
- Shall the State-bank tax be repealed? 571.
- Silver, the crisis in, 553; purchase act, imminent danger from the, 789.
- Socialism, and literary sterility, German, 660; Jay Gould and, 686; the Gothenburg plan, brandy and, 514.
- Special needs of the poor in New York, 492.
- SPOFFORD, AINSWORTH R. The library of the United States, 369.
- St. Louis and Indianapolis, the public schools of, 429.
- Suffrage a failure: shall we abolish it? Negro, 797.
- Sunday, and the Columbian exposition, 194; why the fair must be open on, 541.

- SWIFT, LUCIUS B. Civil-service reform: a review of two administrations, 201.
- SWING, DAVID. For whom I shall vote and why, 401; the enlarged church, 67.
- "Tariff for revenue": what it really means, "a," 51; reform, retrospective and prospective, 697.
- Tax be repealed? shall the State-bank, 571.
- Thackeray obsolete? are Scott, Dickens, and, 503.
- Theatres and the American stage, endowed, 337.
- THURSTON, ROBERT H. The next great problems of science, 42.
- Treatment of China, a Chinaman on our, 85.
- United States, the library of the, 369.
- University of Michigan, popular education at the, 123.
- VAN RENSSELAER, M. G. The artistic triumph of the fair-builders, 527.
- Venal voters, the alarming proportion of, 1.
- Venal voting: methods and remedies, 159.
- Vote and why, for whom I shall, 390, 393, 395, 397, 398, 401, 402, 403.
- Voters, the alarming proportion of venal, 1.
- Voting: methods and remedies, venal, 159.
- Wealth and business relations of the West, the, 631.
- WELLS, DAVID A. "A tariff for revenue": what it really means, 51; tariff-reform: retrospective and prospective, 697.
- WELLS, SPENCER. How to prevent the coming of cholera, 743.
- WELSH, HERBERT. Campaign committees: publicity as a cure for corruption, 26.
- Western life, provincial peculiarities of, 91.
- West, the wealth and business relations of the, 631.
- What immigrants contribute to industry, 600.
- What is a novel? 591.
- What we really know about Mars, 359.
- Wherein popular education has failed, 411.
- Why the fair must be open on Sunday, 541.
- WICKLIFFE, JOHN C. Negro suffrage a failure: shall we abolish it? 797.
- WILLIAMS, GEORGE FRED. Imminent danger from the silver-purchase act, 789.
- WILSON, WM. L. The Republican policy of reciprocity, 255.
- Women in English politics, 453.
- Writers, 131, 265, 409, 551, 694, 806.
- YEN, YUNG KIUNG. A Chinaman on our treatment of China, 85.